

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

No. 2

1940

ENGLAND DRIVES TO A NEW WORLD WAR

(AN EDITORIAL)

THIS IS LEON BLUMI

MAURICE THOREZ

STALIN AND THE SPANISH COMMUNISTS

JOSE DIAZ

STALIN AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

G. OLDNER

PRICE 20 CENTS

PAMPHLETS ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY: THE MEANING OF THE WAR IN FINLAND

By V. M. Molotov, 1c.

MAY DAY 1940

By Louis F. Budenz, 1c.

IS THIS A WAR FOR FREEDOM

By Ernst Fischer, 10c.

LENIN AND KRUPSKAYA

By C. Bobrovskaya, 10c.

THE PEOPLE AGAINST THE WARMAKERS

By Earl Browder, 5c.

THE WAR CRISIS: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

By William Z. Foster, 5c.

SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE WAR

By V. J. Jerome, 5c.

THE WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS OF THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

By Georgi Dimitroff

A NEGRO LOOKS AT WAR

By John Henry Williams, 3c.

I DIDN'T RAISE MY BOY TO BE A SOLDIER FOR WALL STREET

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, 1c.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

No. 2

FEBRUARY

1940

C O N T E N T S

England Drives to a New World War	<i>Editorial</i>	83
This is Leon Blum!	<i>Maurice Thorez</i>	92
Stalin's Teachings—A Lodestar to the Spanish Communists	<i>Jose Diaz</i>	109
Stalin and the National and Colonial Question	<i>G. Oldner</i>	124
Observations on an Issue of <i>Neuer Vorwaerts</i>	<i>K. Funk</i>	140

Workers Library Publishers, Inc., P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City.
Subscription price: one year \$2.00; six months \$1.00. Single copies 20 cents.

J U S T O F F T H E P R E S S

IS THIS A WAR FOR FREEDOM?

By Ernst Fischer

The author of *Is This a War for Freedom?*, price 10 cents, is internationally known as a leading Marxist theoretician. Ernst Fischer, in his new pamphlet, gives us what is perhaps the best and most basic analysis of the second imperialist war since its outbreak. The pamphlet deals with the background of the war, the aims and objectives of the belligerents, the position of the neutral countries, the relationship of forces, what the war holds for the masses, etc. It is a powerful refutation of the claims of Chamberlain-Daladier, and their Social-Democratic apologists, that this is a "war of democracy," a war against fascism.

Price 10 cents

●

LENIN AND KRUPSKAYA

By C. Bobrovskaya

Lenin and Krupskaya, by C. Bobrovskaya, price 10 cents, tells the story of the great Lenin and his wife, comrade and close co-worker, Krupskaya. Of particular interest is the inspiring life of Krupskaya, her untiring devotion to the working class, and her many contributions to the development of socialism. The author, a life-long friend of both, and herself a revolutionary worker for many decades, tells of their exile and imprisonment, their marriage in far-off Siberia, and their close collaboration through the years, both before the October Revolution and afterward, in the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

Price 10 cents

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

England Drives to a New World War

"BRITANNIA! You rule the sea. But the sea does not have water enough to wash away your shame . . . !" More than a hundred years have passed since the great poet Heinrich Heine used these words to brand England, that England which mobilized all the reactionary forces of Europe against the French Revolution; that England which still feared the heritage of the Revolution in the conqueror Napoleon although he had long since become an enemy of the Revolution. England, the satiated, ultra-moral English bourgeoisie, was even then the guardian of reaction in Europe and the great opponent, standing in the background of events, of all revolutionary and liberation movements everywhere.

And even then, the pirates who used treachery and force on week days to build up a world empire, while singing psalms on Sunday and acting like models of morality, were devoted to the principle of driving other nations into war to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for England. Always organizing war against that state on the European continent which was strongest at the time, always supporting the reactionary powers against the forces of revolution, always undermining the peace of Europe and always palming off its greed and self-inter-

est as the essence of all virtue and magnanimity—England became the great, decisive capitalist power, the most perfect embodiment of imperialism.

The English bourgeoisie, which oppresses and exploits many hundreds of millions of people in various parts of the world, keeps an eagle eye on the so-called "European balance of power" and on the chains which hamper the free movement of peoples all over the earth. After having crushed the Spanish, Dutch, and French world power in the course of centuries, England has regarded Germany, ever since the close of the nineteenth century, as its most dangerous rival. In addition to its worry over the so-called "European balance of power," England is increasingly concerned over the strength of the imperialist chains all over the world; and its anxiety over the historical awakening of the enormous masses of people in Asia and Africa is constantly growing. Ever since the victory of the great Socialist October Revolution, the peoples of Asia and Africa have been more and more conscious of their strength. More and more they are getting into motion, more and more they see their mortal enemy in the imperialists, their hope and reliance in the socialist Soviet Union.

The four hundred million Chinese people have risen like a giant to win their national freedom, their political independence and a life worthy of human beings. Out of the depths of the Indian people, three hundred and fifty million strong, there is arising ever more powerfully the desire for self-determination, for freedom from the yoke of English imperialism. A powerful will for freedom is surging across the Arabian countries. The African peoples are dreaming of their national rebirth. The "heavy reserves" of the international working class, of the Socialist Revolution, the peoples oppressed and plundered by imperialism, are emerging from their silence and their darkness into the light which has flooded the world since October, 1917. In this light, the English bourgeoisie sees the greatest danger to its world domination.

Wherever the oppressed in Asia and in Africa begin to stir, they come into conflict with the interests of the British world empire. Wherever a chain in Asia and in Africa threatens to break, a moneybag in the City in London begins to quake. Wherever freedom in Asia or in Africa gets a foothold, a robber in the City in London feels the ground vanishing from under his feet. The English robbers, therefore, have displayed a savage, irreconcilable hatred for the great Socialist October Revolution from the very first day. It is the hatred which their great-grandfathers displayed towards the French Revolution, but magnified a hundred-fold. The French Revolution profoundly dis-

turbed the lords of the City, but the Socialist Revolution arouses in them the premonition that they are approaching their end. For more than twenty years, they have been dreaming and thinking of extinguishing the light radiating over the earth from Moscow and of plunging the awakening peoples back into silence and darkness.

For more than twenty years, English imperialism, whose chain extends over the earth, has been indefatigable in its efforts to crush the socialist Soviet Union. England was behind the generals of the Russian counter-revolution. England was the driving force that organized the wars of intervention against the young Soviet state. England stirred up the civil war and took the opportunity to seize temporarily the Transcaucasian oil wells. England incited Poland against the Soviet Union. England took active part in the establishment of the so-called "sanitary cordon" against the Land of Socialism, that ring of reactionary states which were built up into military points of attack by the imperialist powers. England supported the activity of all counter-revolutionary groups in the Soviet Union, organized wrecking activity and so forth.

In recent years, the crowning thought of the English imperialists was to unleash a war between Germany and the Soviet Union and thereby paralyze their imperialist rivals in Europe as well as in the socialist Soviet state. The Chamberlain Government staked everything on this: it promoted the military rearmament of Germany, it en-

couraged German imperialism to seize Austria and Czechoslovakia, it was prepared to hand over Poland and the Baltic states to it as a deploying ground, and all this only to direct German military power against the East and to drive it into a war against the Soviet Union in which, according to the plan of the English bourgeoisie, the two largest states on the continent would tear one another to pieces.

When Chamberlain returned from the Munich Conference, he considered this daring plan a success and he was received as a triumphant victor by the English bourgeoisie and their Social-Democratic hangers-on. But their rejoicing was premature: Germany showed little desire to hurl itself into a hopeless war against the Soviet Union; public opinion in England became uneasy, and the English imperialists shuffled the cards again in order to draw a final trump. They now attempted to incite the Soviet Union against Germany and sent a delegation to Moscow in order to bring pressure to bear on Germany, to worsen the relations between the two states and to maneuver the Soviet Government into a position which would inevitably lead to war in Eastern Europe. At the same time, English diplomacy was active in Berlin trying to induce the German Government to take the path mapped out at Munich. This monstrous duplicity ended in a fiasco for the English imperialists; the Soviet Union proclaimed its unequivocal determination to maintain peace and prevent the war de-

sired by England; and in Germany, they also saw through the English intentions. The pact between Germany and the Soviet Union smashed the plan of the English imperialists. England had to recognize that the two largest states on the continent were not inclined to cut one another to pieces for the pleasure of the City in London, that, on the contrary, they proceeded by agreement to clean up the artificially accumulated elements of conflict in Eastern Europe.

The political conception of English imperialism which came closest to realization in Munich had collapsed. It is exceedingly characteristic that the Anglo-French imperialists dropped their mask as "saviors of peace" and unleashed war the moment that Germany publicly renounced its war plans against the Soviet Union, the moment the pact assured peace between the two largest states on the continent.

The conclusion of the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union mixed up the English imperialists' cards. England had lost a big game and considered it necessary to correct its luck by force of arms. England had never thought of liquidating the Versailles system and allowing Germany to become strong enough to be able to oppose English imperialism with an entirely independent imperialist policy. The English conception was to allow Germany to become just strong enough to dare to launch a military attack against the Soviet Union; it was to emerge from this war weakened to such an extent

that it would not only constitute no danger for England but would also have no alternative other than to allow itself to be taken in tow by England.

In order to carry out this long-range plan, England was prepared to make many concessions. But the more that German imperialism grabbed, with the help of England, the less it was inclined to risk its neck for the English wire-pullers and hurl itself into a hopeless war against the Soviet Union, and the stronger became its tendency to renounce English tutelage and to oppose its own imperialist policy to English imperialism. The German rulers knew very well that a war against the Soviet Union would bring them the warmest praise of the Western capitalists, the most unctuous blessings of the Vatican and the devoted adherence of the Second International, but they knew just as well that this war could only mean committing hari-kari to the applause of the entire capitalist world. They preferred to forego such macabre sympathies and instead chose to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union.

This turn in German policy was the *immediate cause of war* for England. It is obvious that various combinations are being considered in England in order to achieve the aim of this war. There is no lack of final attempts to produce a new change in German foreign policy, to tear Germany away from the Soviet Union and to revive the policy of Munich. It is more than improbable that these attempts will succeed; friendship with the Soviet Union is

in accord with the deepest national interests of the German people and is a real guarantee for its future as a great and free nation. Furthermore, helped by a part of the German bourgeoisie which, like Thysen, condemns Germany's present foreign policy, there is no lack of attempts to prepare a "palace revolution," with the aid of monarchist and reactionary Catholic circles and the former leaders of German Social-Democracy, to pave the way for a government of capitulation. These attempts do not hold out much promise of success either for England at present; it is clear that in a large country like Germany, serious tendencies towards capitulation can only arise when military defeats produce a profound internal breakdown. The English imperialists, therefore, are preparing for a large-scale, protracted war against Germany, a war in which they are attempting to involve all countries.

These attempts to extend the theater of war, to compel all the "neutral" states to take military part, and systematically to conjure up world war, are in the forefront of British policy today. Accustomed to wage its wars with foreign armies, England is looking around for states that are ready to sell the skin of their peoples to the City. In the mighty fortifications on the West Front gigantic armies confront one another almost without doing anything. But at the same time, England is endeavoring to organize new fronts for the military encirclement of Germany and to send one people after another to the slaughterhouse. In Scandinavia, in the Bal-

kans, in the Near East, everywhere, the agents of British imperialism are developing feverish activity in order to press peaceful peoples into English war service and to employ every means to get them to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for England. What does England care that these people have nothing to gain in such a war and everything to lose!

The cold-blooded cynicism with which England drives peoples into the war, only calmly to leave them to their fate, has already become apparent in Poland. England knew, of course, that in a war against Germany, Poland would be lost and it did not have the slightest intention of "investing" more than promises and credits in a lost cause—and yet, it drove Poland into war in order to force its opponent to suffer losses and to lose blood, without itself incurring any expense. In acknowledgment, the English imperialists later stated that Poland had done its duty and, by its sacrifice of blood, had made it possible for the orderly deployment of the Anglo-French troops on the West Front.

With the same cold-blooded cynicism, England is busy inciting the Northern peoples to a war which has nothing to do with the interests of Scandinavia but which is really contrary to all the interests of the Scandinavian peoples. England knows, of course, that in such a war, Scandinavia would be lost, but the City thinks: let hundreds of thousands of Scandinavian toilers go to a senseless destruction, if only we can cause losses to our

opponent in such a war at others' expense and force him to consume ever more people and war material, ever more blood and oil!

England holds still other peoples in "reserve," the peoples of the Balkans, the peoples of the Near East and so forth. It is determined to throw in one country after another, one people after another; to sacrifice one nation after another through corrupt governments, filthy capitalists and dishonorable adventurers and to drag out the war with rivers of foreign blood and with the devastation of foreign territories until Germany is exhausted and serious voices of capitulation begin to be heard.

In this war against Germany, the English imperialists have not for a moment given up their anti-Soviet plans. Undoubtedly, the *immediate* war aim of the English bourgeoisie is to secure the military defeat of Germany but this military defeat of Germany is not only intended to eliminate its imperialist rival, but England also regards the capitulation of Germany as an indispensable precondition for a further struggle against the Soviet Union.

As long as a strong Germany maintains friendly relations with the Soviet Union, England cannot see any serious possibility of threatening the Land of Socialism. The responsible English politicians, therefore, are more reserved at present than the French journalists and the Social-Democratic lackeys of the bourgeoisie who are carrying on hysterical propaganda for war against the Soviet Union. The decisive English imperialists appa-

rently consider it inadvisable to challenge the gigantic forces of the socialist state at this moment; but they are using every method to keep the Soviet Union "preoccupied" in a military way; to organize a number of military ventures against it. Thereby, they hope to make it difficult for the Soviet Union to supply Germany with the necessary war materials; they want to arouse antipathy for the Soviet Union and, finally, they want to prevent the Soviet Union from continuing its gigantic work of construction in complete peace, and from all too speedily surpassing the capitalist states.

The official reserve of the English politicians, therefore, is closely tied up with anti-Soviet intrigues, with the organization of provocations and aggressions against the Land of Socialism. It was England, primarily, that spurred on the reactionary Finnish bourgeoisie to reject the peace offer of the Soviet Union, to endanger criminally the interests of Finland and to spill the blood of the Finnish people, for the gentlemen of the City. It was England, primarily, that encouraged the Scandinavian reactionaries to give financial and military support to the bloody adventurers, Mannerheim, Tanner and Company and to unleash a savage war incitement in Scandinavia against the Soviet Union. It is England, primarily, that is piling up tinder against the Soviet Union in the Balkans and in the Near East and is setting in motion all anti-Soviet forces.

The threats of individual English and many French newspapers that

a naval fleet will enter the Black Sea, that an air fleet will appear over the Don Basin and Baku, that an army will march into the North and so forth, are of course absurd boasts, but they indicate the character of the so-called "anti-fascist" war which the Western imperialists are waging. Much as the *immediate* war aim of England is undoubtedly to bring about the military defeat of Germany, to secure Germany's capitulation, it is just as much the further war aim of the English, French and American bourgeoisie somehow to launch the general attack against the Land of Socialism.

The old combination, the old bloc against the Soviet state has collapsed: Germany, which was supposed to have been the spearhead, has thought better of it at the last moment. Poland no longer exists. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have concluded pacts of friendship and assistance with the Soviet Union. The brilliant conclusion of the war in Finland has destroyed another imperialist base of attack. Japan has entered upon a hopeless war against the 400,000,000 Chinese people. All those states which England had selected to march against the Soviet Union have thus become more or less useless for the English imperialists at the present time.

But the English, French and American millionaires do not want to renounce the old and repeatedly shattered plan of an imperialist united front against the Soviet Union and are eager to continue the old game with new cards. Their pious wishes are most clearly expressed in the various declarations

and appeals which state that the interests of the millionaires urgently require financial and military support to the Mannerheim gang against the Soviet Union. It must "be clear to the millionaire of the North," the Swedish Major Winge, commander of the Swedish Expeditionary Corps in support of the Mannerheim gang, declared on December 12, that it was now imperative to throw in all resources since "the time is near when there will be no more millionaires." No more millionaires! What an unbearable thought for British puritans and Social-Democratic "labor leaders!"

The English imperialists are directing an entire chorus of propagandists, journalists, trade union secretaries, members of Parliament and so forth, who loudly proclaim what they employers are meanwhile quietly preparing. These beggar-musicians of British imperialism, headed by the wretched leaders of the French Socialists, are shouting themselves hoarse reminding all "neutral" states of their "sacred duty" to enter the war in the interest of the English and French colonial masters. Socialist "pacifists" and fascist Capuchins, Catholic bishops and Social-Democratic Party officials, cunning lawyers and heavy-set orators, unite in inciting against the Soviet Union and in preaching the "holy war" against the Land of Socialism. At one end of this capitalist "united front," the leaders of the Second International howl that the Soviet Union has betrayed the interests of socialism; at the other end, the former patrons of the Nazi Party shout that Hitler

has betrayed the interests of capitalism. Often they exchange the roles assigned to them; then the hyenas of finance who are hoary with iniquity whine that the Soviet Union has surrendered the cause of socialism which is so dear to all the capitalists, and so-called "socialists" wail over the misery of the "suffering millionaires" in Germany. But in the case of all of them, their mouths overflow with what their masters' hearts are full; all of them froth with hatred for the Land of Socialism; all of them agree that not only must Germany be defeated but socialism must also be destroyed. To be sure, these capitalist vultures are in no position to destroy socialism and to prevent its historical victory either with their screams or with their claws, but they undoubtedly hope to make another attempt in this war to turn back the wheel of history and to assail the world of socialism. And world reaction sees in England its protector and champion against the Land of Socialism, against the idea of socialism.

But England itself not only *feels* that it is the strongest pillar of world reaction, England *is* in fact the strongest pillar of the imperialist world system. A fourth of humanity is oppressed and exploited by the English imperialists. While the English colonial masters play at "democracy" in Europe, concealing their bloody hands in white gloves, and their callous brutality behind good manners, they stand before the hundreds of millions of their colonial slaves as merciless butchers and ignominious prison wardens.

Imperialism is a cruel, inhuman power in all countries. And this imperialism is in no way mitigated by appearing in the cloak of "well-fed morality always able to pay," by sugar-coating every crime with moral maxims and Biblical sayings, by behaving like a pious devotee while committing its villainies. A thief remains a thief even when he wears the most expensive neckties.

The working class does not judge the imperialists by their good or bad manners. It fights against *all* imperialists, against the well-mannered as well as the ill-mannered. It fights *against the imperialist world system*, against capitalist exploitation and oppression in all countries and continents.

The international struggle of the working class against the imperialist world system requires *the concentration of forces against the main enemy at the given moment* in the arena of international politics. English imperialism, to be sure, was no less reactionary and predatory in past years, but it kept in the background and did not act *directly* as a war incendiary. French imperialism, allied with it, was temporarily interested in the preservation of peace and therefore drew nearer in its foreign policy to the Soviet Union. It was German imperialism in those years that was the aggressive spearhead of world reaction. It was German imperialism that represented the immediate threat to the peace of the peoples, that proceeded from aggression to aggression and came forward internationally as the champion of the capitalist world against the world

of socialism. In those years it was the task of the international working class to unite its forces against German imperialism as the main enemy in order to defend peace, halt aggression, and safeguard the peoples from the catastrophe of a new world war. The revolutionary workers have never considered the division of the earth laid down at Versailles as just; they have never sanctioned or defended this state of affairs but they were of the opinion that the necessary revision of this situation did not justify a new world war.

The situation changed when it became clear that England was determined to conjure up a war at any price between the two largest states on the continent, a war against the Land of Socialism and, above all, when Germany executed a decisive turn in its foreign policy, when it not only renounced its war plans against the Land of Socialism but even went further and entered into peaceful, friendly relations with the Soviet Union. At that moment, it was England that unleashed the European war and, since then, it has been England that has done everything to extend the theater of war and light the flames of a new world war. Today it is England which rejects all peace proposals, which shows that it is determined to enforce its will by force of arms and drag all peoples into the war.

The working class in the so-called "democratic" states feels personally that the war is directed not only against Germany but that this war is also being waged for the purpose of strangling the revolutionary

struggle of the workers and the aspirations of the oppressed peoples for national liberation and of maintaining the cruel domination of capitalism by every means. The toilers recognize ever more clearly that this so-called "anti-fascist" war is not only an imperialist war but also bears within itself the tendency of turning into a war against the Land of Socialism.

This recognition is spreading in England itself, the center of the imperialist world war plans. The indefatigable struggle of the Communist Party of England against the imperialist warmongers is finding a greater response among the masses from week to week. Trade union and cooperative organizations, Party groups and youth groups of the Labor Party, are openly opposing the war incitement of the official Labor leadership and are fighting for peace. And all the lies and slanders cannot prevent ever-wider sections of the English toilers from seeing in the Soviet Union the champion of their own closest interests, their hopes and reliance.

Since October, 1917, since the victory of the Socialist Revolution in the largest country in the world, English imperialism has organized war in an open and a concealed, in a bloody and a bloodless, in an economic, political and military form against victorious socialism on one-sixth of the earth. All plots against

the Land of Socialism have failed; the Soviet Union is growing stronger and stronger, is growing more powerful and is becoming more and more the magnetic mountain for all the toilers. But the stronger the Soviet Union becomes, the more urgent does English imperialism consider it to unloose the entire capitalist underworld against it. It believed that its crowning idea would become a reality, this crowning idea, which it clung to tenaciously, to enervate the Land of Socialism and at the same time England's strongest capitalist rival by a protracted war—but the artificially-hatched plan collapsed at a single stroke. At that moment, England dropped the mask of a "savior of peace" and came forward as the instigator and organizer of a new world war, as the undisguised champion of world reaction. But, thereby, *English imperialism became the most dangerous incendiary of war and revealed itself to the whole world as the chief enemy of the international working class.*

The international working class, therefore, has the truly historical task of doing all in its power to thwart the plans of English imperialism, of taking up the struggle against the British war incendiaries in alliance with the colonial peoples oppressed by England and, in this struggle, of shaking the imperialist world system to its foundations.

This Is Leon Blum I

BY MAURICE THOREZ

"**H**E WAS one of those young parvenus of the second generation who form an aristocracy of letters, and are the patricians of the Third Republic. His name was Lucien Lévy-Coeur. . . . He had a silky voice, elegant manners, and fine soft hands, which he was always rubbing together. He always affected an excessive politeness, an exaggerated courtesy. . . . Lévy-Coeur represented the spirit of irony and decay which fastened gently, politely, inexorably, on all the great things that were left of the dying society: the family, marriage, religion, patriotism; in art, on everything that was manly, pure, healthy, all the people; faith in ideas, feelings, great men, in Man. Behind that mode of thought there was only the mechanical pleasure of analysis, analysis pushed to extremes, a sort of animal desire to nibble at thought, the instinct of a worm. . . . Lucien Lévy-Coeur was a Socialist. . . . Lucien Lévy-Coeur was not the only nibbler at Socialism. The Socialist papers were staffed by these petty men of letters, with their art for art's sake, . . . who had fastened on all the roads that might lead to success. They barred the way to others, and filled the papers, which styled themselves the organs of the people, with their dilettante decadence. . . ."

This portrait of a Socialist Pharisee was sketched with a masterly hand by Romain Rolland in the "Market Place," the Fifth Book of his *Jean Christophe*. This book was written in 1908; it was a portrait drawn from life. The author knew his model well—Leon Blum, his fellow student at the Ecole Normale Supérieure.

The Socialist leader is a member of a big bourgeois business family. The offices of the Blum Company are located in the Sentier business section in the heart of Paris, two steps from the Stock Exchange, the modern temple of the golden calf.

As was the custom among the leading families of the ruling bourgeoisie, the two Blum brothers were prepared for two different but complementary careers. One heads the business, with the job of making a profit out of the family's capital by exploiting proletarians. The other, the one that interests us particularly, was chosen to guard the interests of the Blum firm and all other capitalist firms, to protect the privileges of the exploiting class. He chose administration and "politics" as his career. To the Lévy-Coeurs, this consists of the corrupt art of swindling and cheat-

ing in order to deceive the working class, to mislead it by lies and hypocrisy, to demoralize it and divert it from its struggle for liberation, in short, to preserve the rule of the bourgeoisie.

Thus, Leon Blum became a lawyer. He entered the Council of State. This super-Parliament, whose members are carefully selected, as we know, watches over the content and form of the laws and decrees. It assures the continuity of the executive power—and the effectiveness of the dictatorship of capital—by sending its “legal specialists” into the Ministries and large administrative bodies of the bourgeois state. In this way, Blum became the Cabinet chief of Marcel Sembat, the Socialist Minister of the first imperialist World War.

For Leon Blum was a Socialist. Yet, as he declared at the Tours Congress, “I have appeared only twice in the public life of the Party.” (Stenographic Minutes of the Tours Congress, 1920, p. 273.) And it is quite true that Leon Blum carried on his first very limited activity in the Socialist Party from 1904 to 1905 only, just time enough to lend his support to the revisionist and opportunist wing that was condemned by the International Congress in Amsterdam. It is also true that he resumed his active service—for the bourgeoisie—only in 1917 as a supporter of the imperialist war for which the proletarians were to shed their blood, and as a disorganizer of the labor movement.

Before he wormed his way into the leadership of the Socialist Party,

Leon Blum devoted himself primarily to literature. One could search in vain in his ambiguous prose for even the slightest trace of a vigorous thought. The refined esthete wrote an *Essay on Marriage* which enjoyed a certain amount of success in the salons and the society of the morally degenerate profit-chasers, but which was ignored by the revolutionary proletarians.

Leon Blum was one of the most important collaborators of the *Revue Blanche* (*White Review*), a product of questionable eclecticism. Here he supported Millerandism and broke a lance against Marxism. In his cunning and dissimulating manner, he repeatedly attacked Jules Guesde, the strongest disciple of Marx in France at that time. Following that, Leon Blum devoted himself to theatrical criticism in *Matin*, the most venal of all the Parisian papers, which pocketed checks from that Raffalovich whose coffers were fed with the Tsar's gold. At that time *Matin* was daily smearing Jaurez and the Socialists with buckets of filth just as today they are smearing Communism and the Soviet Union.

The first imperialist war began. The Socialist Party sank into the swamp of civil peace. Yet, after three years of suffering, sorrow and horror, in 1917, the first rumble of dissatisfaction could be heard among the masses in France. In the East, the revolutionary wave had already swept away the tsar and it continued to mount until it had swept everything out of the way, like a mighty human flood, led by the Bolsheviks, by Lenin

and Stalin, and made room for a new world, the new world of socialism on one-sixth of the earth.

The effects of the Russian Revolution were not long in coming. Opposition to the war grew among the working class, the trade unions and the Socialist Party. And Leon Blum came forward in the Socialist Party once more. But Leon Blum was absolutely alien to the working class, not only because of his origin but also because of his activity and mode of life. Everything about him betrayed the aristocrat: his mode of life, his studied elegance, his language, his affected style. He was simply the conscious agent of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the labor movement.

In December, 1920, the Tours Congress decided by an overwhelming majority to affiliate the Socialist Party with the Communist International founded by Lenin. Leon Blum spoke up in the name of the chauvinist and imperialist minority. His speech bore the usual stamp of his dishonesty and despicable casuistry. He pretended to be a revolutionist and even a supporter of the dictatorship of the proletariat but wanted to prove that the Communists had turned their backs on Marxism—nothing more nor less—and that they had slipped down into anarchy, Blanquism and even into the conspiratorial position of the Carbonari.

Leon Blum knew very well how to tack on an "ism" to his words. He loved to juggle with ideas; he knew how to impute fantastic conceptions to his opponents which he then disposed of very easily. At that

time, in the period of revolutionary upsurge, after the first imperialist war, Blum had the mission of demoralizing the masses, of frightening and diverting them from the struggle for power. Slandering the workers and reviling their revolutionary enthusiasm, Blum spoke with contempt of the danger which was supposed to exist in "basing oneself on a kind of instinctive passion and on the herd-like force of the great and inorganic masses." (*Ibid.*, p. 263.)

The Communist position always considers the first task to be the gathering, organizing and leading of the laboring masses in a conscious and effective struggle against the power of the bourgeoisie. Leon Blum caricatured and distorted this correct thought. He wanted to discredit all forms of revolutionary action. He even dared to provoke the Congress by declaring that the workers "could not even capture a fire station."

Blum used still another sleight-of-hand trick. He declared his readiness for illegal work—though, however and but!—he added that he abhorred secret activity. Even at that time Blum put on the act of slanderously charging the Communists with being a "secret society" based on "storm troops" and obeying "secret and irresponsible committees." (*Ibid.*, p. 255.)

Daniel Renoult, an old fighter in our Party, a pupil of Juarez, became indignant at Leon Blum's "provocative speech" at the Congress, as he said. He declared: "This is nothing but a report of the investigating magistrate Jous-

sellin against the imprisoned Communists, translated into the language of the Congress." (*Ibid.*, p. 277.) Recently, the reactionary Fernand Laurent quoted one of Blum's pamphlets of 1931 in the Chamber which was *republished* in 1937 and which slandered our Communist Party in an infamous manner to the great joy of reaction.

And thus we see Leon Blum, after the Tours Congress, at the head of the Socialist Party and later as the editor of its paper. Leon Blum despises the simple members of the Socialist Party. He never has contact with the workers. His special field is in the struggle against opposition movements. He is the man of "synthesis," or "reconciliation," of meaningless resolutions that conjure away the disputed questions, that sugarcoat the contradictions.

At the same time, the pensioned Councilor of State does not neglect his legal practice. The finance magnates scramble for his expensive advice. Leon Blum pleads for their dirty business in the courts. At one time, one could even witness the spectacle of Blum defending the industrialist Lederin against another politician lawyer and member of the Socialist Party, Paul Boncour, who also represented a capitalist firm, the big Thaon Laundry. It was also learned in the Chamber that once Leon Blum did not at all find it beneath his dignity personally to intercede with reactionary Ministers on behalf of rich capitalists whom he wanted to free from part of their taxes—several millions were involved.

And Leon Blum is most at home among the dignitaries of the bourgeois republic. The Socialist leader who is so dignified in public and before his Party members speaks in the familiar form to Tardieu and Herriot. It is true that from time to time there is a fuss raised about it in the Socialist Party; for example, at the time when Blum was too open in his support of the reactionary Forgeot against the candidates of his own Party. It was also learned at that time, that this happened because the editor of *Le Populaire* wanted to show his gratitude to M. Forgeot because the latter had secured a position for Blum's son with the Hispano-Suiza Company. Knowing the important interests of this industrial firm in Spain, the "non-intervention policy" which brought Leon Blum such mournful fame is not so inexplicable.

In 1924, the first really "free" elections since the war took place. The Communist Party fought courageously against the Treaty of Versailles, against the occupation of the Ruhr. It combated chauvinism and called upon the French soldiers to fraternize with the German people. It proposed to the Socialist Party to establish united action of the working class during and after the elections and to form a workers' and peasants' bloc. But Blum secured the rejection of the Communist proposals. Instead, he led the Socialist Party into an agreement with the Radical Party in the so-called "Cartel of the Left." Instead of uniting the workers, he split them still further. He placed a part

of the working class directly in the service of the bourgeoisie. And the result? Two years after the election victory of the "Cartel of the Left," the worst reaction was again in power.

In 1925-26, Blum was also one of the people chiefly responsible for the war in Morocco and Syria. He demanded a "vote of condemnation" against the Communist deputies who rejected the war and he demanded the persecution of the Central Committee of Action Against the War. His despicable role as a warmonger and colonial oppressor was clearly revealed by the notorious letter of Vatin-Periguon. This high French official in Morocco described the general political and military plan of operation of the imperialist circles in his letter and concluded "*Blum will do the rest.*" In other words, the bourgeois, entrusted to prepare the Socialist Party, will take care of his miserable business in the labor movement!

In 1926, at Blum's instigation, the Socialist Party decided "*to permit the Poincaré experiment.*" The finances of the bourgeois state were in an indescribable condition. The deficit was mounting. The government treasury was empty. The franc dropped precipitously. The cost of living rose rapidly. The working class was dissatisfied. Demonstrations increased. Strikes broke out. Then reaction brought Poincaré back into the government—the man of war and misery, the man of the Ruhr and double taxes. And Leon Blum performed like mad in order to spare his "friend Poincaré" all

difficulties, the man to whom he had paid warm and solemn tribute in a speech in Bordeaux (1927). With the help of his other companion and accomplice, Tardieu, Leon Blum succeeded in forcing through the election of a Socialist, Fernand Bouisson, as President of the Chamber.

The Parisian toilers did not restrain their feelings against the traitor Blum. In 1932, the workers of the Twentieth Arrondissement, that section in which the last Communards fought and died, drove Blum from his Deputy's seat; in his place, they elected a Communist functionary who was being persecuted and sought by the police, Jacques Duclos. And Blum, who ordinarily remains quite cool, lost his head. Infuriated, he gave vent to his hatred. He reviled the Parisian toilers, who will always adhere to the Party of the working class, and wrote: "*The Communist cadres must be destroyed!*"

But Communism continues to advance. The influence of the Soviet Union on the toilers of the capitalist countries grows. The workers who suffer unemployment, low wages and privation know that there is no longer any unemployment in the Soviet land. They see how the first phase of reconstruction, the gathering of forces and consolidation of power, was followed by a period of unprecedented advance of socialist construction.

The Bolshevik Party, under the powerful leadership of Stalin, triumphantly achieved the general line of industrialization and of collectivization, in spite of the oppor-

tunist capitulators who became traitors in foreign service. Full of enthusiasm, the peoples of the Soviet Union fulfilled the First Five-Year Plan. Labor became a matter of honor. A new era dawned in which life is easy and full of happiness for all—men, women, children, old and young. Soviet science is radiant and incomparable. The deeds of the fliers and seamen of the Soviet Union, its Polar explorers and the discoveries of its scientists arouse the admiration of all toilers and honest people in the capitalist world.

But Leon Blum launches a vile campaign of systematic derogation of the Soviet Union and its magnificent accomplishments. Despite the increasingly numerous protests of the Socialist workers, *Le Populaire* has never printed a single line favorable to the Soviet Union, but instead it daily carries the worst counter-revolutionary nonsense and the most wretched anti-Soviet slanders.

To put out his filthy sheet, Leon Blum utilizes a clique of Mensheviks and renegades from international Communism—Rosenfeld, Rossi and Co. He, the chief reviler, tries in every way to minimize the importance of the growing achievements of socialist construction. And he does not shrink from comparing the free and happy toilers of the Soviet Union with the slaves of antiquity. He declares perfidiously: "With a sufficient number of slaves, one can always build pyramids." (*Report to the Twenty-Eighth Congress of the Socialist Party, 1931, p. 75.*)

The Communist Party served the laboring masses with utmost devotion. It fought for the workers' wages and for aid for the unemployed, for peasant aid, for the protection of the youth and the maintenance of the aged and sick. The Communist Party fought for the unity of the working class. A strong current of unity was becoming more and more perceptible. Thereupon, Leon Blum sought to erect a dam. The bitter enemy of labor unity strove to pile obstacle upon obstacle. Since he could not oppose the slogan of unity, he wrote hypocritically: "It would be regrettable if the rapprochement should take place prematurely. . . ."

But unity of action was necessary and urgent. Only unity of action could enable the working class to repel the onslaught of reaction. But what did that matter to the bourgeois Leon Blum? On the contrary, he tried to create the belief that the menace of reaction was really not very serious. In November, 1932, after the elections in Germany, Blum wrote: "The road to power is now closed to Hitler. . . . Social-Democracy has disposed of Hitler." And two months later, Hitler became Reich's Chancellor.

One might say, Leon Blum is a bad prophet. Events nearly always refute his learned prognostications and he, himself, has often enough had to admit that he has been seriously mistaken. But that does not prevent him from continuing to make new assertions with the incisive tone of absolute certainty. The great man of Social-Democracy tries to give the false impression of

knowledge. In reality, his vision does not reach beyond his nose.

"But for the most part, it is not a matter of "mistakes" on his part, but of a conscious, well-calculated policy discussed in the leading circles of the bourgeoisie. When the toilers finally come to the conclusion that Blum's policy is dangerous and harmful, he acts as if he were ready to admit an error. The sly politician then understands that he cannot maintain his standpoint without being exposed as a direct agent of the bourgeoisie and losing all influence on the working class. He then calculates cold-bloodedly that it would be better for him to feign that his credulity had misled him and to utter hypocritical sighs of regret in order to preserve at least some credit with the toilers who are insufficiently informed and who, in general, easily tend to be generous. He can then continue his shabby business and each time he finds a new and more refined method of deceiving the working class.

Over a period of many years, Leon Blum, with an ardor worthy of better things, combated the frequent proposals of the Communists for united action. At first he declared that the very thought of contact with the Communists was unbearable. Then, under the pressure of the masses striving for unity, when he was compelled to give up this purely negative attitude, he sought to justify his hostile attitude towards united action with observations on organizational unity. And giving way another step, Leon Blum tried to escape the united front in France by claiming that the united

front must first be achieved on an international scale. But at the same time, he combated the united front proposals which the Communist Party made time and again to the Socialist International.

Finally, in 1934, Blum had to acknowledge on the front page of his newspaper that the Communists had made the united front "unavoidable" by their tireless activity. The leadership of the Socialist Party had simply been forced into this by the toilers' will for unity. The majority of the Socialist workers—numerous local sections and many provincial organizations—had already been won for common action with the Communists. Thereupon, Blum followed his famous recipe: "I am their leader, hence I follow them." But he followed his troops only to keep from losing control of them and in order to retain the possibility of leading them as he wished at the first opportunity. He merely continued his struggle against the unity of the working class in another form. This is shown by his entire activity since July, 1934, since the conclusion of the pact for united action at the initiative of the Communists, and the formation of the People's Front following it.

In May, 1936, the People's Front won a tremendous election victory. As the leader of the Socialist Party, the party which had received the most seats in Parliament, Leon Blum became Premier. At the Extraordinary Congress of the Socialist Party on May 30, 1936, he said: "I am not Kerensky; after I go, Lenin will not assume the heritage."

At that moment, taking into con-

sideration the difference between the situation in Russia in 1917, namely revolution, and the situation in France in 1936, characterized chiefly by the retreat of reaction under the pressure of the masses, Leon Blum's words had the following significance: "My worthy capitalist friends, do not be disturbed; I shall do everything to break the upsurge of the masses. I shall do everything to see that the People's Front does not give the working class and the people the perspective of a tangible and lasting improvement in their situation, that your profits are not reduced and your rule, *our* rule, is not endangered. In order to prevent my standing here some day as a Kerensky, I shall be a Noske, a Mueller. I shall pave the way for reaction against the People's Front, against the working class, against Communism."

And in fact, Blum and his government did not hesitate to turn their backs on the program of the People's Front. Already at the beginning of August, Blum delivered a frightful blow at the People's Front. On his initiative, the catastrophic, alleged "non-intervention" followed, that *"tragic error which the Spanish people had to pay for with their blood,"* as the Socialist Party of Spain once wrote to the French Socialist Party.

Today, everyone sees that it was not an "error" but the execution of a well-considered plan of international reaction against the working class and the People's Front in Spain and France. The traitor Blum committed one of the greatest

crimes of a career which is so full of crimes. As the agent of the French and British capitalists, he unhesitatingly deprived the Spanish people of the means which would have made it possible for them to smash the rebellion of the oath-breaking generals and the foreign invasion. He sacrificed the cause of the People's Front, the future of the working class and even the security of the French Pyrenees frontier to the objectives of reaction and the war preparations of the capitalists of all countries.

Leon Blum knew that a defeat of the Spanish Republic would soon be followed by the defeat of the People's Front and the working class of France by reaction. He knew that the people of France would shortly face the horrors of an imperialist war, but this is exactly what Blum and his ilk wanted to bring about by their criminal procedure. This ignominious Tartuffe tried to justify the death sentence which he handed down to hundreds of thousands of Spanish men, women and children with phrases about the necessity of preserving peace. He became so repulsive in his hypocrisy that those who sometimes had to have contact with him could scarcely overcome the desire to retch out of sheer revulsion. The hypocritical comedian tried tears, sobbed, was on the verge of fainting.

Once, Blum received the representatives of the Spanish People's Front in his luxuriously appointed office in the Hotel Matignon. They had come to beseech him to lift the

cursed blockade. Pasionaria speaks in flaming words, she describes the suffering of the Spanish people, speaks of the will of the unarmed heroes to resist, of their super-human courage, says that those who are fighting are convinced that they are fighting for the cause of all supporters of progress and peace throughout the world, for the future of the toilers of all countries. Full of emotion, she speaks of the thankfulness of the republicans of Spain for the aid given them by the French people which had sent its best sons into the trenches before Madrid so that it remains free; and of the tangible aid to free Spain. Without mincing words, she also expresses her opinion that unfortunately Spain misses the feeling of active solidarity on the part of the Ministers and especially the Premier, a solidarity which inspires the French people and especially the glorious proletariat of Paris. Pasionaria finishes.

Then Blum rises, having lowered his eyes under the bitter reproaches of Dolores Ibarruri, and approaches her. He seems to be most profoundly hurt. A long sigh escapes from his chest. And raising his hands to heaven, he exclaims: "What torture this is to me! I understand you! I am in agreement with you. But I cannot do otherwise!"

And the revolting comedian cold-bloodedly and mercilessly made sure that the blockade was carried out with brutal severity. Under his government, the French Consulates in Spain became disruptive centers of desertion that aimed to destroy the new Spanish people's army.

With Blum's consent, the French Consul in Valencia carried his disruptive work right into the barracks. Again and again he boasted of his counter-revolutionary politics when he turned to his reactionary friends.

At the end of 1938, Blum reminded the Chamber that two years earlier he had issued the order to hold in Hendaye, France, the arms and munitions which the Republican Government wanted to send to the front from Irun. He himself said that a few dozen of these machine guns belonging to the Republicans would have been sufficient for the militia to beat back the Franco bands. And had they been able to hold Irun, it would have been possible to hold San Sebastian, Bilbao and the entire Basque country and Asturias. A former Socialist Minister has confirmed this fact in a speech made in Santiago, Chile, and published in *Socialista*, adding that "it was even worse" than Blum said. And throughout the whole Spanish war, Blum carried on intrigues among the Spanish Socialist leaders, hatched plots with Caballero, Prieto, Besteiro and Company in order to put over his wish for a compromise with Franco and to split the People's Front. As the agent of capitalist England, he was the direct inspirer of Casado and the other traitors who stabbed the defenders of Madrid in the back and turned them over to the Franco butchers.

Like Lady Macbeth, Leon Blum must feel persecuted by the spirits of his innumerable victims. He must see with horror-stricken eyes the

innocent blood upon his hands.

In February, 1937, Leon Blum ordered a "pause." He declared that it was time "to catch our breath" and "to digest" the reforms of the People's Front. Now, the only noteworthy achievements of the working class were those which it had secured by its own direct action in May, 1936: the 40-hour week, paid vacations, collective agreements. When the delegates of the C.G.T. called upon Blum in 1936 in his offices in the Hotel Matignon, he said to them: "Good, I shall support these proposed laws in October." Frachon replied: "They must be adopted by parliament immediately, within forty-eight hours!" And that is what happened under pressure of the masses.

As early as September, 1936, Blum undertook the first devaluation of the franc, which increased the cost of living and partially nullified the wage increases. The aged were still waiting for their pension in February, 1937, and the unemployed for work. The postal employees, under the administration of Lebas, were waiting for the 40-hour week, the youth for the inauguration of the apprenticeship system, the peasants for relief, the fulfilment of the big highway construction, irrigation and electrification program. But Blum decided to renounce openly the program of the People's Front. He was desirous of weakening the labor movement, undermining the People's Front. Ibar-negaray has stated, and this statement was printed in the *Journal Officiel*, that Leon Blum facilitated the reorganization of the

subversive organization of the Croix de Feu. The explanation of these crimes was given on the eve of the bloody provocations in Clichy.

Despite the protests of the laboring population of this city, administered by Socialists, Leon Blum and his Socialist Minister of the Interior Dormoy permitted a meeting of the Croix de Feu in a hall close by the City Hall. It was the period when criminal attacks and murders instigated by the hired agents of capital and foreign powers followed one right after the other in France.

The toilers demonstrated their outrage at the provocation organized by Dormoy's police. But they marched peacefully in the street. Thereupon, at the command of a Socialist Division Commander, the gendarmes shot into the masses of workers. There were numerous dead and dozens of wounded were hastily removed to Baujon Hospital. The Communist leaders immediately hurried to Clichy, to the spot where the slaughter had taken place and to the wounded in the hospital. Towards midnight, Monsieur the Premier appeared in gala evening clothes. Not before then did the murderer of the workers of Clichy leave his loge in the opera and come stiffly in his formal clothes with white shirt front, white gloves and silk top hat and a cloak over his shoulders. A roar of indignation rose from the crowd of parents and relatives of the wounded and among the workers waiting in front of the hospital. Several of the wounded congratulated the government chief with bitter irony for the care with

which he kept order in the streets—against the workers.

In July, 1937, Blum left his post as Premier without the Chamber having voted against the Government. As a pretext, he utilized parliamentary difficulties which he had met in the Senate. The Communists proposed to Blum and the Socialist Party not to yield to the pressure of reaction and to organize the resistance of the masses in order to initiate a powerful joint action inside and outside parliament as was done in February, 1934, in July and August, 1935, and in May, 1936.

But Blum succeeded in preventing any kind of joint action. Later on he openly declared that such a struggle "would have extended throughout the country and would have been expressed in serious popular movements which would have constantly gained in scope and energy." (*Le Populaire*, July 5, 1937.) And Blum and the bourgeoisie wanted to prevent this at all costs. Blum is dominated by fear of the mass movement. Naturally, the frightened petty-bourgeois, and also that big bourgeois who poses as a Socialist, attributed their own feelings of cowardice and pusillanimity to the working class. Thus, Leon Blum declared in Bordeaux that there could be no thought of fighting, "since today, a need for rest among the masses of people, a need for recuperation and quiet, is connected with the passionate fire of conviction."(!) How clearly this carefully calculated phrase reveals the Socialist petty-bourgeois—"fire of conviction and need for rest!" Let us be fiery, but quiet, just

quiet! Let us speak, chatter, hold speeches, but, God forbid, no actions of the working class! That is the line of the Blums.

In September, 1938, Leon Blum made himself the spokesman of the Munich capitulation. He who had turned Spain over to Franco could not fail when it was a matter of applauding a betrayal which turned Czechoslovakia over to Hitler. Today the whole world is able to see that Munich did not mean peace, but on the contrary an infamous conspiracy of international reaction against peace, the peoples and the Soviet Union. Munich raised in an acute form the question of the division of the world among the capitalist rivals. It opened the last sluice through which the flood of blood and slime of the imperialist war rushed out. But in October, 1938, Leon Blum extolled the beauty of life. In his unbearable and shameless manner of hypocritical public self-analysis, the egoist and epicure confessed his feeling of "cowardly relief and shame." Later, of course, he acknowledged his "error of Munich." But his first thought was only of giving his support to Daladier, that other unscrupulous politician.

On October 4 the Socialist parliamentary group, at Blum's urgent request, consented to the betrayal at Munich. And on the same day it decided not to oppose Daladier's request. The results were the hunger decrees which smashed the social legislation secured by the pressure of the People's Front and the strike of November 30, 1938, which was betrayed by Blum and

Jouhaux and brutally suppressed by their companion, Daladier. The further result: the annihilating blow against the Spanish Republic, the introduction of the scandalous concentration camps in which the heroes of the Spanish people's army and the glorious fighters of the International Brigades were penned like criminals. Still a further result: the general attack on the working class and all toilers, *and the imperialist war.*

Lenin wrote in December, 1914:

"The European War is the greatest historical crisis; it means the beginning of a new epoch. Like every crisis, the war has sharpened the antagonisms deeply hidden underneath, has brought them to the surface, tearing apart all the hypocritical cloaks, rejecting all conventionality, destroying all discredited or half-discredited authorities." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVII, p. 96.)

And in his pamphlet on the "Collapse of the Second International," he added:

"The war of 1914-1915 is a break in history of such magnitude that the attitude towards opportunism *cannot* remain as of old. . . . Pre-war opportunism—speaking on a general European scale—was in an adolescent stage, as it were. With the war it grew; it can no more be made 'innocent' or youthful." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 312-13.)

Events today emphatically confirm the powerful thoughts which Lenin expressed in the first impe-

rialist World War. The present war exposes and sharpens all the contradictions of the capitalist regime. It signifies a clash of the most important imperialists who are challenging one another for world domination not only in the international field. It is also accompanied within all capitalist countries, primarily inside the belligerent countries, by an unprecedented intensification of the exploitation of the laboring masses and a corresponding extension of the position of reaction. The war annihilates the pacifist and democratic illusions with which the Socialist politicians lulled the working class. And though we already well know the traitorous policy of the Socialist leaders, the enormity of their new crimes simply leaves us aghast, and these cannot be judged in the same way as before the war.

Thus, for a political canaille of Blum's stripe, there is no uniform standard by which to measure what he said and did yesterday and what he says and does today. Blum, like the repulsive reptile that he is, has given up twisting and hissing like a snake. Now he gives free rein to his savage instincts of a bourgeois exploiter who for a moment trembled for his privileges. He no longer tries to conceal the real content of his policy—protection of the interests of capital. Like a chained dog, he barks at the working class, the Soviet Union and Communism.

"Never are governments so much in need of peace among all the parties of the ruling classes, and of a 'peaceful' submission to this rule by

the oppressed classes, as in time of war." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 280.)

Daladier can certainly brag that hitherto he could carry out his war policy with the *consent* of all parties of the bourgeoisie, the Socialist Party included. But he could not achieve the *subjugation* of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party. In 1914, the Socialist Party, in the tow of its traitorous leaders, deserted the cause of the proletariat and placed itself in the service of imperialism. In 1939, the Communist Party headed by its Central Committee—with the exception of a handful of cowardly and uninfluential renegades—remained true to the cause of the working class, the cause of peace. It proclaims the unjust, reactionary imperialist character of the present war. It calls upon all the toilers to fight against reaction in France and to enforce immediate peace. It fights further for the defense of the demands of all exploited. It enthusiastically popularized the firm peace policy of the Soviet Union which the imperialist warmongers, despite all their efforts, could not plunge into the bloody chaos.

Reaction is insane with rage at this consistent and determined opposition to the imperialist war. A campaign of suppression is raging against the working class, against the Communist Party. The hyena Blum places himself at the head of the howling pack which has been unleashed against Communism and the Soviet Union. Immediately

after the signing of the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, Blum began an ignominious and provocative campaign. To satisfy him, Daladier and Sarraut provided him with the suppression of *l'Humanité*. This was the first act. Thereupon the miserable wretch performed a virtual war dance. He sent insulting and shameless demands to the Communist functionaries. He pressed them to renounce their Party and their International, to disavow the Soviet Union, to betray the interests of the working class if they did not want to be turned over to the military tribunals. He revived the vile slander against the Communists which cost Jaurés his life. They are "foreign agents," this infamous lackey of London bankers wrote. Blum made himself a jailor who provided victims for the prisons and jails. He sank to the very depths of baseness; he proposed to the government that it "*put the Communist functionaries on trial, condemn them and pass sentence on them.*"

However, all the blows of the Government and Blum have been unable to shake the unity of the Communist Party. Reaction was unable to achieve the sensational and numerous desertions which it hoped to bring about by corruption, extortion and threats. The Communist Party remained firm. It sharpened its line of irreconcilable opposition to the imperialist war. It adopted measures for the development of mass action against reaction and the war.

Thereupon, the Government suppressed the Communist Party. This

suppression was provoked, prepared and made possible by Blum and his accomplice, Jouhaux, that other turncoat traitor. Both of them let loose a flood of slanders against the Communist functionaries, expelled them from trade union leadership and incited the police against them. Blum demanded and obtained the arrest of the Communist deputies, demanded and obtained the revocation of their mandates which had been entrusted to them by the vote of the people. *Le Populaire* plays up the police reports on the mass arrests of the Communists as if they were dispatches of victories at the front. And with satisfaction it emphasizes the severe sentences of five and six-year imprisonment imposed on the fighters for peace. With cynical scorn it expresses its joy that thousands of Communist workers are lying "on the damp straw of the dungeon."

For the French bourgeoisie, which is so prudent in waging war against capitalist Germany, is waging war with merciless severity against the working class. It wants to break all opposition to its policy of reaction and war. With the help of Jouhaux and Blum, it dissolves the trade union organizations that want to continue defending the interests of the workers. It can thus reduce wages, increase working hours and step up taxes; it can shift the cost of a war which amounts to almost a *billion francs* a day onto the shoulders of the poor. But the workers are dissatisfied and offer resistance in the factories. Blum's rage knows no bounds. Demagogically, he in-

cites the peasants against the workers, the soldiers at the front against their mobilized comrades in the factories. "I do not hesitate to declare," he writes, "that public opinion will not tolerate the constant increase of wages." (*Le Populaire*, January 6, 1940.) But the wages have not been increased at all; on the contrary, despite the increased cost of living, they have been saddled with a 15 per cent tax, and after the eighth working hour with a 40 per cent tax. And Blum attacks the wage increases demanded by the workers in the following words: "No one will tolerate blunders in the financial and economic conduct of the war that will endanger its outcome." What does Blum care about the suffering and the lives of the unfortunate people? All that exists for him are the war aims of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Zealously, even if unsuccessfully, he fulfils the task assigned to him by reaction of justifying the war to the workers.

Many proletarians understand that the present war is a predatory war of plunder. They do not forget that the Communists have always said: capitalism brings war. They remember the powerful words of Jaures: "Capitalism bears war within itself just as the clouds bear the storm." They recall that Lenin emphasized that if socialism does not triumph in Europe, peace between the capitalist states will only be an armistice, an interruption for the preparation of a new slaughter.

Lenin has performed the incalculable service of showing and emphasizing that in the present stage

of the development of capitalism—the imperialist epoch which is characterized by the formation of powerful monopolies, the domination of big banks, the export of finance capital, while the division of the world has already been completed—war is the only means of producing changes in the relation of forces among the big capitalist states. The only means which the imperialist brigands have of securing their “share” of world domination in the exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and the “free” toilers of the so-called civilized countries.

The teachings of the works of Marxism enable us to lay bare the deep causes and the aims of the present war. The French bourgeoisie wants to maintain the dominant positions which it secured with the signing of the Versailles Treaty against the German bourgeoisie. French imperialism wants to keep the colonies which German imperialism—and Italian imperialism—are after.

But Blum the warmonger wants people to believe that capitalist France has taken up arms with unexampled altruism in order to “remain faithful to its obligations to Poland.” He pretends “that the war forced on France has as its true and sole aim the independence and security of the fatherland.” (*Le Populaire*, November 25, 1939.) He asserts that millions of French workers and peasants are facing death only “to save modern civilization, which is founded upon the natural rights of the individual, civil liberties and justice towards

individuals and peoples.” (*Le Populaire*, December 21, 1939.) What repulsive hypocrisy, what repugnant cynicism is contained in these words of this knave who invented the “non-intervention policy,” that one-sided violation of the obligations which France had entered into in its trade treaty with Republican Spain; of the “cowardly and shameful” defender of Munich, that one-sided violation of the obligations which France had assumed in its express treaty of alliance with Czechoslovakia; of the representative of that predatory bourgeoisie that oppresses 70,000,000 colonial slaves.

Whom does the police assistant and informer Blum want to convince that France is still “a land of freedom”? In face of the fact that 10,000 toilers have been thrown into prison or concentration camps, that the Spanish refugees and the volunteers of the International Brigade are also languishing in concentration camps, that Daladier has reintroduced the *lettre de cachet*, the arbitrary warrant of arrest of the ancient regime, that the free press has been suppressed, that parliament has been fettered and the deputies who have remained loyal to the people have been ousted from their seats and cast into jail!

As during the last war, Blum wants to convince the misled toilers that this is really the “last” one. He promises them a “new world” in which “social justice” shall reign. The workers should not be deceived by these clumsy lies which are not even original. If the working class does not stop the war in its own way

by driving reaction and its Blums from power, they will be menaced by other "last" wars.

But where Blum even outdoes himself in infamy is in his attacks against the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party and Stalin, that giant of revolutionary thought and revolutionary deed. In his furious rage of a ranting warmonger, Blum reveals the background of the anti-Soviet policies of the French bourgeoisie. Reading Blum's stuff in the columns of his contemptible sheet, every toiler can recognize that the enemy against whom the French bourgeoisie would prefer to unite the forces of the rival imperialists is the Soviet Union, the land of socialism.

Thereby Blum only betrays the rage and disappointment of the war provocateurs who were unable to involve the Soviet Union in a bloody conflict, the burden of which it alone would have had to bear. The complete inactivity of France and England towards Poland—despite their promises—shows clearly that the reactionary leading politicians had hoped that the war would become primarily a war against the Soviet Union, a war which they would have then stood by and watched, rubbing their hands in glee, and in which they would even have given discreet aid to Germany. This vile calculation was thwarted. The Soviet Union is pursuing its independent and resolute peace policy. And Blum, whose rage is constantly mounting, openly began to preach a crusade against the Soviet Union. He wrote: "For a number of years, the Hitler menace has

caused Europe to forget the Russian menace." He palpitated with unholy joy when the Finnish reactionary Government, supported by the Anglo-French imperialists, replied with provocations to the good-neighborly proposals made by the Soviet Government for the regulation of the frontiers. The Red Army was compelled to act in defense of the Soviet frontiers. Thereupon, the man of "non-intervention" urgently demanded that Mannerheim and Tanner "be sent airplanes, artillery and war material of all kinds." (*Le Populaire*, December 25, 1939.) One can imagine what opinion the laboring masses have of this scoundrel after having greeted his hated name for thirty long months with a thousand-voiced cry: "Airplanes and cannon for Spain!"

The mercenary liar, Blum, launched the lie about a "democratic and socialist Finland." He portrayed the bandits who terrorized the Finnish people and, according to the testimony of Branting, slaughtered 18,000 workers, as "an elite by virtue of its culture and moral worth." He was jubilant when the League of Nations, which had become the mere agency of Anglo-French imperialism, adopted measures which tended in the direction of a war against the Soviet Union. But he was impatient: "Faster! The action must be coordinated!" he wrote. He pressed Sweden and Norway to go to war against the Soviet Union and to supply soldiers to the ignominious cause of international reaction.

Blum tramples Guesde's last ad-

monition in the dust. Guesde said: "*We must protect the Russian Revolution.*" Happily, the French toilers do not want to wage war against the Soviet Union. And in case of necessity, they will know how to follow the glorious example of Andre Marty and the sailors of the Black Sea Fleet.

The history of the international labor movement is rich in lofty figures of revolutionary fighters, firm and courageous fighters for the great cause of socialism. But it also knows contemptible traitors shunned by all the toilers. The Millerands, Pilsudskis, Mussolinis, Noskes and Trotskys were swept out of the labor

movement. Blum combines within himself Millerand's abhorrence of socialism, Pilsudski's inhumanity, Mussolini's savagery, the cowardice which creates bloodhounds like Noske, and Trotsky's hatred of the Soviet Union.

The working class cannot fail to nail this moral and political monster to the pillory. It cannot fail to condemn and turn with abhorrence from Blum the bourgeois, Blum the man of "non-intervention," Blum the man of the "pause," Blum the murderer of Clichy, Blum the police agent, Blum the man of war. This is a prerequisite for the victorious struggle for peace, for socialism.

Stalin's Teachings—A Lodestar to the Spanish Communists

BY JOSE DIAZ

THE national revolutionary war in Spain kept the revolutionary and progressive forces of the whole world at a high tension for two and a half years. The Spanish people waged a magnificent armed struggle in defense of its revolutionary achievements and its national independence against a superior enemy, a struggle that was protracted, stubborn and rich in heroism.

A united front of the entire international reaction, a united front of the imperialist powers, had actually crystallized against revolutionary Spain. These powers—some openly, others in a more or less concealed form—pursued a policy of intervention on a grand scale against the Spanish people. In order to help reaction strangle the heroic struggle of revolutionary Spain, the leaders of the Second International joined forces with reaction and the traitor Blum, in the name of the Second International and at the behest of the English and French imperialists, proceeded to slip the noose of “non-intervention” around the neck of our people.

Thus, the struggle of the Spanish

people was strangled by the united forces of reaction which attacked the country. However, the heroic resistance of revolutionary Spain, written in letters of fire, will live forever in the minds of the Spanish and the international proletariat, in the minds of the toiling masses, in the minds of the peoples subjugated and enslaved by capitalism. The lessons of the heroic struggle of the Spanish people will help them to understand better the nature of capitalism, the instigator of predatory wars. These lessons will serve them as a weapon in the struggle against the exploiting classes, in the struggle against the present imperialist war.

The Spanish people found the energy to resist the superior forces for such a long time because it fought for a just cause, because the broadest masses took active part in this struggle with flaming enthusiasm, with unsparing self-sacrifice, with inexhaustible initiative; and because the general uprising of the masses of revolutionary Spain, of the toilers united in the People's Front, evoked a wave of international solidarity in all countries

and found unstinted moral and political aid and support primarily among the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

This broad mobilization of the workers, the peasants, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the progressive intellectuals, however, would not have been possible without the consistent work of the Communist Party, without its correct Marxist-Leninist political line.

The Communist Party was able to develop this political line and to put it into practice, making it the backbone of the struggle of the Spanish people only because it always strove to follow the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and to apply, in the concrete conditions of Spain, the tactical principles of Leninism which were developed and supplemented by Stalin.

The Concrete Situation in Which the Struggle Developed, and the Strategy of the Communists

Comrade Stalin teaches us that the starting point for the development of a correct political line is "*the principle of absolutely taking into account the national peculiarities and the specific national features of each single country.*" (J. V. Stalin, *Remarks on Timely Themes*, p. 19, Russ. ed.)

What does this mean? It means that it is not enough to learn by rote various theses and teachings of Marxism-Leninism to avoid political mistakes, but that it is indispensable for the Communist Party to analyze the concrete internal and international situation with the greatest care, to study with the

utmost seriousness its interaction and alignments. Only an analysis which does not merely make a general comparison of the situation at a given moment with that of other epochs and in other countries, but also takes into account the specific features and characteristics of the situation, only such an analysis can serve as the starting point for the formulation of a correct political line.

What was the concrete situation? And what were its specific features at the moment of the uprising of the Spanish reactionaries and during the period of intervention?

Spain was primarily an agrarian country of a petty-bourgeois type with considerable remnants of feudalism. This general character of the country was not changed during the five or six years of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (from April, 1931, to July, 1936), which preceded the national revolutionary war. Fifty-nine per cent of the employable population was engaged in agriculture and not more than 20 per cent in industry, transportation and commerce. The rest of the population was employed either in the state administrative apparatus or in the municipal apparatus, in the army and in the so-called free professions. The distribution of land ownership was the best indication of the peasant, petty-bourgeois character of the country with strong influences of feudal remnants on the economic and political life

Two per cent of the land owners, who could be described as large landowners (one hundred hectares and upwards), possessed 67 per

cent of the entire arable land. To this group belonged the enormous latifundias of the Duke of Alba covering 96,000 hectares, those of the Duke of Medinaceli with 79,000 hectares, as well as those of the Duke of Peneranda with 52,000 hectares, and others. Eighty-six per cent of the owners of land (up to ten hectares) possessed altogether only 15 per cent of all the arable land. This picture becomes even clearer when we add that 39 per cent of all the owners of land possessed less than one hectare and that this enormous mass of land-impo- verished peasants possessed altogether only 1.1 per cent of the entire acreage. Besides this, there were two and a half million land workers who had no land at all. A considerable part of the peasants who were counted as owners of land in the statistics, in reality were nothing but tenants or sub-tenants, so-called "*rabassaires*," a tenant relationship which most clearly reflected the semi-feudal character of Spanish agriculture.

The Catholic Church, the consort of feudalism, possessed nearly one-third of all the wealth of the country as well as a third of all the arable land. There were 200,000 monks in Spain. As against the 35,000 schools in Spain, there was a total of 38,000 churches, monasteries and chapels.

Of the 24,500,000 inhabitants, 7,000,000 belonged to the national minorities of Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia. The national question was only partially solved by the Republic. The complete solution of this question was still ahead.

Heavy industry and machine construction, the barometer of the economic level of every country, were only slightly developed. Light industry (working-up of agricultural products, textile industry, etc.), which employed 67 per cent out of the total of 1,900,000 industrial workers, occupied a dominant position in the whole economic development of Spain. In light industry, handicraft production played an exceptionally big role; in the textile industry the small and middle owners likewise predominated. Light industry was only slightly concentrated. The opposite was the case, however, in heavy industry, especially in mining (coal, iron-ore, lead, copper, potash, quick-silver, etc.). Here, monopoly capital played a decisive role.

Spain was a capitalist country which oppressed colonial peoples; at the same time, however, Spain was a country exceptionally dependent on foreign capital, a country which was the theater of struggle between individual imperialist Powers who fought one another for consolidation of their own influence in this country at the expense of their rivals.

The strong remnants of feudalism prevailed especially in the army and navy as well as in the state apparatus whose leading cadres, particularly the top cadres, were recruited from the old-established nobility.

The historical consequences of this backwardness of Spain, as well as its medieval past which had not been completely overcome—provincialism, cantonalism, and regional-

ism—could be felt at every step. Provincialism not only put its stamp on the economic and political life of the country but also influenced the labor movement which was far more disunited than in any other large country of Europe. The well-known Spanish "Caciquism"* predominated in the state apparatus as well as in the villages, in the municipalities, in the political parties of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie, including the Socialist Party, in the trade union centers of the U.G.T. and the C.N.T.** Many provinces and cities were under the control of a clique of a few powerful and influential people who held sway absolutely without any hindrance.

Although the bourgeois-democratic revolution lasted more than six years, the basic tasks confronting the revolution remained unsolved, primarily the agrarian question. . . . Of the total of 4,000,000 land-impoveryished peasants and land workers, only 150,000 had received land and this to an entirely unsatisfactory extent, without the necessary tools and instruments for its cultivation. The Church which was formally separated from the state was able to preserve all of its material possessions and consequently also a considerable part of its influence on political life. The army remained what it was before: the old reactionary army dominated

by a caste spirit, a nest of counter-revolution. The condition of the working class likewise had not changed essentially.

The working class and peasant masses reacted to the sabotage of the capitalists and landowners with strike struggles and other methods of struggle. However, they did not receive the necessary support from the government, which was composed of representatives of the republican parties, so as to liquidate the counter-revolutionary machinations of the bourgeoisie, the landowners and the military which were secretly preparing an uprising.

This characterization of the internal situation must be supplemented by some of the most important features of the international situation in which the struggle of the Spanish people was taking place. This international situation was characterized by the intensification of the contradictions among the separate imperialist powers although this intensification had not yet led to the unleashing of war. In other words, there was still the possibility of forming a reactionary united front against revolutionary Spain.

All these peculiarities of the internal situation of the Spanish Republic as well as of the international situation were of decisive importance for the strategic task of the working class. To the Communist Party it was clear that in such a backward country as Spain, whose democratic problems were unsolved and which was faced with the urgent necessity of extending the social basis of the struggle inside the country as well as the

* *Cacique*—the most influential figure in the semi-feudal Spanish village, the chief representative of the reactionary policies of the landowners, in reality, the all-powerful and absolute lord and master of the village.

** The General Workers Union and the National Confederation of Labor respectively.—*The Ed.*

basis of international solidarity, the socialist revolution could not be posed as the immediate task. For that reason, the Party, basing itself on the analysis of the given situation and on the concrete estimation of the interaction of forces, set itself the task of *further developing and completing the bourgeois-democratic revolution*.

This goal could only be attained by transforming the bourgeois-democratic republic into a democratic republic of a new type, a republic without big capitalists and landowners, *a people's republic* in which power would not be in the hands of the bloc of the bourgeoisie and the landowners as in the republic established April 14, 1931, but in the hands of the bloc of the working class, the peasants, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the national minorities, a bloc in which the proletariat was destined to play the leading role.

The Communist Party understood that the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution was a decisive prerequisite for interesting the broad masses of workers, peasants and petty-bourgeoisie in the armed struggle against the Spanish reactionaries and foreign interventionists, and that, furthermore, only a military victory over this enemy could make it possible to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution and thus create the necessary prerequisites for the complete victory of the working class.

The Tactics of the Communists in the National Revolutionary War

But Comrade Stalin also teaches

us that, in working out a correct political line and putting it into practice, it is not enough to confine ourselves merely to a concrete analysis of the situation in each country during each single period of struggle. A correct analysis can only be the basis, only the indispensable starting point for a correct tactical line. In addition to this, it is necessary to take into account:

"... the principle on the basis of which the Communist Party of each country must utilize even the slightest possibility of assuring an ally to the proletariat among the masses; even if this ally is only temporary, vacillating, insufficiently firm and uncertain." (J. V. Stalin, *Remarks on Timely Themes*, pp. 19-20.)

There were such mass allies of the proletariat in Spain. The Communist Party waged a consistent struggle in order to win these allies to the side of the proletariat. Its whole tactic, during the entire course of the national revolutionary war, was permeated by the effort to attract and keep these allies of the proletariat.

But in order to enable the working class to attract mass allies, to keep them, and to lead them over every turn and twist in the road and all the difficulties in the war; in order to enable the working class to overcome all frictions and conflicts and to eliminate all obstacles along its road, it was necessary to have a revolutionary party, a party which has accumulated sufficient experience, which is solid and disciplined, a party which can master the advanced revolutionary theory.

The working class needed a truly Communist Party. Only such a party was able to assure the unity of the working class and faith in its own power during the struggle, as well as its hegemony in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in the struggle for national independence. We Spanish Communists fought for the creation of such a party.

The decisive prerequisite for the realization of this leading role by the working class was the revolutionary unity of the proletariat. The Spanish proletariat was disunited. In addition, the Communist Party entered the arena of battle in a period when other parties, for example, the Social-Democrats and the Anarchists, already had great influence among the working masses. In individual provinces, as in the Basque country and Galicia, a considerable part of the workers were still under the influence of the bourgeois nationalist parties. The majority of the working class was united in two of the biggest trade union organizations, the U.G.T. and the C.N.T., organizations which had had deep roots in the Spanish labor movement for a long time. But these two trade union centers marched separately, each going its own way and not infrequently bitter fights took place between them.

All this shows that the question of realizing the unity of the proletariat in Spain was different from what it was, for example, in pre-revolutionary Russia. There, as Comrade Stalin points out, the political party of the working class had come into existence before the trade unions. There, the political

party directly led the struggle of the proletariat in all spheres, including the economic struggles.

The situation was different in the capitalist countries of Western Europe and Spain where the trade unions had come into existence much earlier than the labor parties. This peculiarity of the Western labor movement was expressed even more sharply in Spain than in the other countries. All the more so since Anarchism which was deeply rooted in the labor movement had carried on a systematic struggle against participation in politics by the workers and had done everything in its power to prevent the proletarian masses from understanding the decisive role of the revolutionary party in the labor movement.

The Bolsheviks who, under the brilliant leadership of Lenin and Stalin, had created a revolutionary party of a new type, were able right from the very beginning of the labor movement, by an irreconcilable struggle against the Mensheviks, to prevent the latter from taking root in the decisive sections of the labor movement and were thereby also in a position to insure the revolutionary unity of the working class under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. The situation was different in Spain. The Communist Party of Spain had to forge this unity during the war. It had to make up for all that had been neglected in the course of decades and it was therefore necessary to take into account the powerful role which the trade unions traditionally played in the labor

movement, and after the outbreak of the military uprising in the life of the entire country.

The Communist Party had achieved certain partial successes on the road to the creation of the unity of the working class (realization of united action between the U.G.T. and the C.N.T.); but it did not attain its main goal and primarily because cliques of politicians, reformists and Anarchists firmly entrenched in the apparatus of these two trade union organizations did not concern themselves with the interests of the working class since they did not want to carry the struggle to a victorious conclusion but, on the contrary, were trying to bring about capitulation. The lack of trade union unity weakened the unity of the working class and prevented the proletariat from playing the decisive role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and in the struggle for national independence.

The most important ally that the Communist Party had to attract to the side of the proletariat was the tremendous mass of the peasantry. From the first day of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Party fought for the solution of the agrarian question and, at the same time, for the liquidation thereby of the feudal remnants which were widespread and deeply rooted in the country. In this way, it could establish a firm bond between the working class and the millions of peasants.

Our Party was the only political party in Spain which understood the vital necessity of such an alli-

ance. It was the only party which issued the slogan of the confiscation of landed estates and church lands without compensation, as well as the slogan of the free distribution of this land among the poor peasants and agricultural workers. The Party was able to carry out the solution of this most decisive problem of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in a revolutionary manner only in the course of the war. It based itself on the revolutionary determination of the peasant masses to secure land.

The decree issued by the Communist Minister of Agriculture on October 7, 1936, fundamentally solved the agrarian question in the republican zone free from Franco rule: 4,860,386 hectares together with the inventory which is indispensable for cultivation of the land passed into the hands of the poor peasants and the agricultural workers. In addition, by granting credits and seeds, as well as by means of technical aid, the Ministry of Agriculture gave the most intensive material aid.

The Communist Party, striving for a close alliance with the peasants, took into account that the overwhelming majority of the peasants were not yet ready to cultivate the land collectively. It was therefore necessary to wage a stubborn and bitter struggle against the Anarchists as well as against the anarchistic Socialists who propagated the adventurist policy of the forcible collectivization and syndicalization of the land. Thanks to this consistent policy and the practical work of the Communist Party, these

enemies of the peasantry who had done so much damage to the cause at the beginning of the war were unable to achieve their goal. The alliance of the working class and the peasantry was strengthened and assured.

By assuring this alliance with the peasant masses, however, the problem of allies was not yet fully solved. It was also necessary to draw in the sections of the lower middle class in the cities as well as those sections of the bourgeoisie which, for one reason or another, were interested in the struggle for the national independence of Spain. The People's Front policy as well as the endeavor of the Communist Party to broaden the social base of the People's Front with the object of transforming the People's Front into a national front was determined by the necessity of establishing a broad fighting front of the entire people under the leadership of the working class.

Since our Party went directly to the masses of people and to the soldiers and explained to them its own position which differed from that of the other parties and organizations in the People's Front, our Party was quite successful in reaching its goal. In this way, it gained influence among other parties and organizations and was able to induce their leaders to take the road pointed out by the Communists and desired by the masses.

The unification of the Socialist and Communist youth was of exceptionally great importance for the consolidation of the unity of the people's forces and for the exten-

sion of our possibilities for struggle. The United Socialist Youth gave the movement tens of thousands of self-sacrificing fighters who were loyal and devoted to the cause of our people.

From the very first days of the rebellion, the Communist Party understood that it was necessary to have a well-armed force, an army for the struggle against such a powerful enemy as ours. This recognition was strengthened by the experiences of Soviet Russia's civil war and the foreign intervention against it. We were guided by the words of Comrade Stalin which he had uttered at the Eighth Congress of the Bolshevik Party when the war against the interventionists was still in full swing:

"Either we create a real worker and peasant—primarily a peasant—army, a strictly disciplined army, and defend the republic, or we perish." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* [B.], p. 235. International Publishers, New York.)

The Fifth Regiment established by the Communist Party was the basis for the realization of our line directed towards giving the people a politically reliable and trained military force. The social composition of the Fifth Regiment, its organization, discipline, fighting capacity and its heroism proved to be the strongest argument in convincing the broad masses whose hostility to the military was deeply rooted in hatred for the old army that the creation of a strong military formation was indispensable.

Without it, the possibility of a successful struggle against internal and foreign reaction was entirely inconceivable.

By its daily experiences, the Fifth Regiment was able completely to demolish the "theories" of the Social-Democrats and Anarchists who, because of their inability to understand the fact of the transformation of our civil war into a national revolutionary war, stubbornly resisted the creation of an army on the "ground" that Spain was a country of partisans and not of soldiers and that its army always acted against the interests of the people. A serious blow was likewise delivered at the plans of the leaders of the republican parties and the military who aimed at merely uniting the remnants of the old army. The Communist Party knew how to overcome the resistance of all these and to insure the creation of a regular people's army. The creation of a regular people's army followed the dissolution of the Fifth Regiment. The 70,000 fighters of this regiment were the nucleus and the soul of this new army. Thousands of the best commanders and commissars of the people's army came out of the Fifth Regiment.

However, with the creation of the army, new tasks arose for the Communist Party. The struggle for the necessary reserves had to be continued and it was also necessary to protect the political unity of the army against the daily attacks and the intrigues of the leaders of the Socialist, the Anarchist and Republican parties.

The line followed by the Party

on the organization of the country's economy was determined by the necessities of the war as well as by the necessity of utilizing all possibilities to keep our allies. The war demanded the concentration of the most important economic resources of the country in the hands of the Government. However, these objectives had to be achieved without weakening the alliance of the working class with the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie as well as with a part of the bourgeoisie. For these reasons, the Communist Party formulated the question of nationalization in such a way as *not to affect all industries* but only those enterprises that had been left behind by their owners who were connected with counter-revolutionary rebellion, as well as key industries, chiefly the war industry but also the transportation system (railroads, shipping and automobile transport).

The Communists advocated co-ordination of the basic branches of economy and therefore proposed the establishment of a Supreme Economic Council. The Communists combated the expropriation and the "collectivization" of small plants, a practice which was very much in vogue with the Anarchists and the Caballero-ites. The Communist Party carried through a policy which made it possible fully to utilize all the resources of the country without repelling the allies, at the same time strengthening the leading role of the working class in the development of the economic life.

The Communist Party fought for the establishment of a strong peo-

ple's government, for a government which was capable of overcoming all difficulties and obstacles, capable of assembling and utilizing all the progressive forces and resources of the country in the interest of the victory of the Spanish people. It fought for a people's government which would express the alliance of the working class with other social strata of the population that were interested in the struggle for national independence. It fought for a government in which the leading role was to be reserved to the working class.

The Communist Party did everything in its power to destroy the old state apparatus and to establish a new apparatus in the service of the people. Such a strong people's government and such a state apparatus, indispensable instruments of a determined policy guaranteeing victory, could not be achieved, however, because of the insufficient revolutionary unity of the working class, because of the intrigues and the sabotage of the Social-Democratic, Anarchist and Republican leaders.

The Communist Party took account of the great importance of the tactical principle formulated by Comrade Stalin concerning the necessity for insuring mass allies for the working class. Our allies, for example, the Basque and Catalanian nationalists, and also the Spanish republicans, were constantly vacillating; they proved to be unstable and wavering. The Communist Party succeeded in keeping the allies on the side of the working class for a long time. However, the

Party was unable to keep these allies of the working class up to the end of the war. The vacillations of the allies increased particularly in the final phase of the war; a part even left the People's Front at the most difficult moments. That was one of the causes for the defeat of revolutionary Spain.

*The War in Spain Was a Lesson
for the Masses and also for Us
Communists*

In determining our political and tactical line, we Spanish Communists took into account the tactical principle of Leninism formulated by Comrade Stalin:

"The principle of absolutely taking account of the truth that propaganda and education alone are not yet sufficient for the political education of millions, but that the political experience of the masses themselves is necessary." (J. V. Stalin, *Remarks on Timely Themes*, p. 20, Russ. ed.)

The bourgeois-democratic revolution, particularly during the period of the national revolutionary war, provided the masses with tremendous experience. In the course of this great struggle, the proletariat recognized its power and its role as a leading class. The peasant masses saw in the working class their new ally and best leader.

Thousands of new people emerged from the depths of the working class and from the Spanish people, men who, thanks to their heroism and their abilities, held 80 per cent of the higher and 90 per cent of the intermediate positions of command. In industry and agriculture, tens of

thousands of men, women and youth revealed their creative enthusiasm by displaying a productive power hitherto unknown in the country and thereby insuring uninterrupted work in spite of the fact that the centers of production were the object of the chief and constant air attacks and bombardments by the enemy.

The initiative of the masses, their enthusiasm and their abnegation were the prerequisites for our biggest military operations: the defense of Madrid is the most conclusive evidence of the will and the energy of the people which made up for the mistakes of incompetent and subsequently traitorous commanders. A further evidence is the defense of the Levant where thousands of fighters fought without the slightest let-up for weeks on end, where the masses, with the fevered energy of inspiration, transformed the fields and hills of the Levant into fortified zones within a few days, blocking all the roads to the invading enemy. Finally, we must cite as evidence of this the battle at the Ebro, one of the biggest battles of our war, in which thousands of fighters, soldiers, commanders and political commissars stood firm for more than four months under the fire of hell and gave an example which may once again serve as evidence of the invincible power of the working class and its creative capacities.

In our war, the masses acquired their knowledge from living examples, a knowledge which is of decisive importance for the continuation of the struggle under new

conditions. The masses grasped the importance of revolutionary unity, they understood that it is the task of the working class to assume leadership in the struggle of the entire people. They understood the importance of a firm alliance with the peasantry. After their bitter experiences with the "non-intervention policy," they understood the importance and the essential nature of bourgeois democracy as a form of capitalist rule. They convinced themselves that this democracy is nothing but a means for deceiving the masses, nothing but a smoke-screen behind which the ruling sections of capitalist reaction conceal themselves. They convinced themselves with their own eyes that the "theory" and practice of anarchism collapsed at the first contact with the reality of the people's revolution. They convinced themselves that Social-Democracy leads the working class to defeat and that the leaders of the Second International betray the interests of the international proletariat just as they betrayed the interests of the Spanish people.

In their stubborn and heroic struggle, the masses recognized that there is no other road to liberation from exploitation and the yoke of capitalism than revolutionary struggle. The Spanish working class recognized that proletarian internationalism is that force which welds the working class into a united front against the common enemy. From the experiences of their struggle, it also recognized the deep abyss which separates the capitalist states from the land of socialism. The idea

of socialism therefore struck deep roots in the consciousness of the masses for, during the days of the difficult struggle, its most devoted friends were by their side. That is why the Spanish workers utter the words "Soviet Union" and the name of Comrade Stalin with profound and inexhaustible love.

Millions of workers, peasants and intellectuals have understood the role of a revolutionary party for the first time. They saw this party in its daily work, at the most dangerous posts and they recognized in it a powerful, reliable force capable of defending the interests of the working class. They recognized it as their *own* party. That is why they joined with it in solving the daily tasks; that is why they actively supported it and gave it their fullest confidence.

If the toiling masses were able to understand all this, it is only because of their own experiences and the leadership of the Communist Party which strove to raise their class consciousness on the basis of their own experiences.

If the Communist Party became a genuine mass party of the working class, it is because it not only educated the masses but also learned from the masses. In doing this, we followed the eminent words of Comrade Stalin:

"We leaders see things, events and people from one side only; I would say, from above. Our field of vision, consequently, is more or less limited.

"The masses, on the contrary, see things, events and people from another side; I would say, from below.

Their field of vision, consequently, is also in a certain degree limited. To receive a correct solution of the question these two experiences must be united. Only in such a case will the leadership be correct." (J. V. Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, p. 56. Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

At the beginning of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (April, 1931), our Party was not much more than an association of groups scattered throughout the country, lacking ideological clarity as well as organizational stability. The Party grew in the daily struggles, gradually freeing itself from sectarianism and by 1935 numbered 20,000 members.

The Party's active participation in the armed struggle in Asturias, its work in uniting the forces of the working class, its vanguard role of drawing all the progressive forces of the country into the ranks of the people's front against reaction—which was preparing the establishment of a terroristic dictatorship—all this encouraged thousands of supporters to join the ranks of the Party so that it had 100,000 members on the eve of the putsch engineered by the generals.

When the armed struggle began, the Party had to solve political and organizational tasks of the greatest importance while on the march, so to speak; tasks which in view of their character and their scope were unprecedented. The war required Party cadres for the army, for industry, for the fields, for the state apparatus, for the trade unions and for the current Party work; it required reliable and capable cadres

who understood the new situation and were the real guides and leaders of the masses.

The Communist Party grew and was steeled in the armed struggle at the front and in the struggle against the enemies of the people at the rear, against the so-called Fifth Column and criminal counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. The Party grew and was strengthened in the struggle against Anarchistic adventurism and against Social-Democratic opportunism.

Comrade Stalin teaches us to watch over the unity and ideological purity of the Party. We waged a merciless struggle against all deviations in our ranks; we strengthened Party discipline and were able to establish iron unity in our ranks to the extent that we were able to meet all the tests which the war brought with it.

The teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the Party of a new type enabled the Spanish Communists to forge a party of more than 300,000 members (in the Republican territory alone), a Party which corrected its mistakes and was not afraid of criticism and self-criticism. From the great Stalin, we Spanish Communists also learned revolutionary boldness, vigilance against the intrigues of the enemy, firmness in carrying out policy, and flexibility in face of sudden unexpected changes in the situation.

Our Party enjoyed the authority and support of the broadest masses. And that was quite natural since the people saw the courage and the heroism of the Communists during the unforgettable days of the de-

fense of Madrid, of Teruel and the battles at the Ebro. The people saw that the Party did not merely confine itself to correct directives and teachings but led the way by example. The Party understood how to communicate its spirit of self-sacrifice and heroism to the masses. During the uninterrupted struggles, the Party always maintained the closest ties with the masses. That is why the Communist Party was loved by the Spanish people and will always continue to be loved.

The Communist Party of Spain followed a correct political line during the national revolutionary war. But it was not free from mistakes. The chief mistake of the leadership of our Party was the fact that, in face of threatening counter-revolutionary rebellion in Madrid (March 5-6, 1939), it did not inform the masses of this; and that it did not act as boldly and resolutely, when the rebellion was already in progress, as the difficult situation required. But the Party always recognized its mistakes honestly which contributed to the fact that its prestige and ties with the masses were only strengthened.

But despite the correct political line of our Party, the Spanish people suffered a serious defeat. The Franco Government wanted to utilize this fact in order to destroy our Party, that selfless and ardent fighter against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the landowners. Despite the countless blows against the Party, it will always live, for it lives deep in the hearts of the masses.

In the new situation, the Spanish

Communists were seized neither by panic nor despair. We remember the words of Comrade Stalin:

"A real revolutionist is not one who displays courage in the period of victorious uprising, but one who knows how to fight well not only at the moment of the victorious advance of the revolution but also in the period when the revolution is retreating, who displays courage in the period of the defeat of the proletariat, who does not lose his head, who does not go off the track when the revolution suffers defeat and the enemy records successes, who does not become panicky and fall into despair in the period when the revolution is retreating." (J. V. Stalin, *On the Opposition*, p. 105, Russ. ed.)

Our Party, educated in the spirit of Lenin and Stalin, has preserved its political unity, its loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, its firm determination to overcome this transitory and difficult period. It has preserved its unshakable faith in the inevitable victory of the working class. All this steels the Communists and makes them firm, unshakable champions of the working class.

Neither the sudden change in the situation nor the propaganda with which reaction wants to conceal the imperialist character of the war, neither hunger nor terror are able to disconcert the Communists, to frighten or terrorize them.

The majority of our members are fulfilling their Party duty in the new situation also. In the concentration camps of Spain, simple

Party members are giving an example of steadfastness, self-sacrifice and an unshakably firm will to meet these new tests of the struggle.

Franco's tribunals have condemned thousands of Communists but they have been unable to hold a single public trial of Communists as they did in the trials of the "penitent" Socialist and Anarchist leaders, because the Communists are steadfast and courageous in the preliminary hearings and in court as befits proletarian revolutionists.

The thousands of Communists, penned-up in the hell-holes of French concentration camps, preserve their loyalty to the Party and the working class.

"You will understand the difficulty of our situation," one comrade writes, "for the policy of reaction is frightful towards us. Each day, the struggle assumes sharper forms inside as well as outside our prisons. Our enemies utilize every opportune moment to deal us a blow. But we are resisting and they are driven to despair. To this very day, we have not lost a single position, a single man. We guard the Party like the apple of our eye and can record good results.

". . . We find the direction ourselves, we increase our resourcefulness, we do not submit but go forward. We shall never desert our place of honor as the vanguard which we conquered for ourselves. We perfect ourselves in the daily struggle against the enemy and by studying the work of our teachers.

". . . Our roofs are falling to pieces, the windows are without panes, the doors do not close and our stomachs are empty, but you may be sure that our arms are

not folded—we are fighting for our common cause.”

The triumph of reaction in Spain has not eliminated the causes which drove our people into battle, but has only made them more acute. The working class, the peasants and the masses of people have experienced better days. They had the factories and the land in their hands; they had seen what freedom is and they were masters of their own fate. Our people lived without landlords, without big capitalists and they know what this is worth.

For that reason, the struggle continues in a new form in this new situation, a struggle to reconquer that which was robbed from the masses, a struggle to enhance all the gains up to complete emancipation. For this struggle, the masses

have the rich experiences of a war and a revolution which constitute an invaluable arsenal for the coming battles.

The Spanish working class has its Communist Party which—educated by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and steeled in the severest struggles—is working for the reunification of its own forces and the forces of the working class for the struggle against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the landowners. In the Communist Party, the Spanish working class has a Party which, in the present difficult situation, will more than ever be guided by the brilliant teachings of the great masters Lenin and Stalin, a Party which will lead the working class to victory under the triumphant banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Stalin and the National and Colonial Question

BY G. OLDNER

THE national and colonial question is one of the decisive questions of the working class struggle because it is a question of "heavy reserves," primarily of the peasant masses who constitute the main army of the national movement. We owe the fundamental guiding ideas on the national and colonial question to Marx and Engels who analyzed the events that occurred during their time in Ireland, India, China and the Central European countries, Poland and Hungary.

On the basis of these ideas of Marx and Engels, Lenin developed the theory of the national and colonial question. Lenin's contribution to this theory consists in the fact:

"(a) that he gathered these ideas into one symmetrical system of views on national and colonial revolutions in the epoch of imperialism; (b) that he connected the national and colonial question with the question of overthrowing imperialism; and (c) that he declared the national and colonial question to be a component part of the general question of international proletarian revolution." (J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 363, International Publishers, New York.)

Comrade Stalin has also further developed the great work of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national and colonial question. Even during Lenin's life, Comrade Stalin was the co-creator of the Bolshevik theory and policies on the national and colonial question.

Starting from the basic ideas of Marx and Engels on the national and colonial question, Lenin and Stalin worked out the theory, the strategy and tactics of the working class on the national and colonial question for the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. Comrade Stalin has further developed it in a creative manner in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism and the victorious construction of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The profound and comprehensive system of thought which Lenin and Stalin worked out in the national and colonial question differs fundamentally from the "theories" of the Second International. In his article, "The National Question Presented," written in 1921, Comrade Stalin emphasizes the following main distinctions:

"The first factor is that the na-

tional question, as a part, has become merged with the general question of the emancipation of the colonies, as the whole. In the era of the Second International it was usual to confine the national question to a narrow circle of questions relating exclusively to the 'civilized nations.'... The tens and hundreds of millions of the Asiatic and African peoples suffering from national oppression in its crudest and most brutal form did not as a rule enter the field of vision of the 'Socialists.'... These apologies for Socialists did not even suspect that the abolition of national oppression in Europe is inconceivable without the emancipation of the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa from the oppression of imperialism, and that the former is organically bound up with the latter." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, pp. 111-112. International Publishers, New York.)

By tying up the national question with the colonial question, the Bolsheviks transformed the national question:

"... from a specific question, affecting the internal policies of a particular state, into a general and international question, into a world question of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples in the dependencies and colonies from the yoke of imperialism." (J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 64.)

Secondly, it is the slogan of the *self-determination of nations* which fundamentally distinguishes the standpoint of the Bolsheviks from the standpoint of the Second International.

"When they spoke of the right

of self-determination, the moving spirits of the Second International as a rule never even hinted at the right to political secession—the right of self-determination was at best interpreted to mean the right to autonomy in general." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 112.)

The vague slogan of the self-determination of nations which allowed for the possibility of justifying annexation was transformed by Social-Democracy into an instrument for the subordination of nations to imperialism. The Bolsheviks therefore supplanted it by an unequivocal revolutionary slogan of "... the right of non-sovereign nations and colonies to political secession," (*Ibid.*, p. 113) the right of nations to independent state existence.

Thirdly, the Bolsheviks disclosed:

"... the organic connection between the national and colonial question and the question of the power of capital, the overthrow of capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat." (*Ibid.*, p. 114.)

"The imperialist war has shown, and the revolutionary experience of recent years has again confirmed:

"1. That the national and colonial questions are inseparable from the question of emancipation from the power of capital;

"2. That imperialism (the highest form of capitalism) cannot exist without the political and economic enslavement of non-sovereign nations and colonies;

"3. That the non-sovereign nations and colonies cannot be emancipated without the overthrow of the power of capital; and

"4. That the victory of the proletariat cannot be a lasting one unless the non-sovereign nations and colonies are emancipated from the yoke of imperialism." (*Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.)

This formulation of the question also explains the sharp emphasis on the fact that the *national and colonial question is by its very nature a peasant question*. Speaking before the Yugoslav Commission of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in March, 1925, Comrade Stalin explained, among other things, that the national question, to be sure, must not be identified with the peasant question:

"... for, in addition to peasant questions, the national question includes such questions as national culture, national statehood, etc. But it is also undoubted that the peasant question after all constitutes the basis and intrinsic essence of the national question." (*Ibid.*, p. 202.)

The Bolsheviks, therefore, gave prominence to the problem of the middle strata and primarily the peasantry, and were "the first to solve it successfully, despite the 'theories' and jeremiads of the heroes of the Second International." (*Ibid.*, p. 187.) In doing this, they observed "that nine-tenths of these nationalities consist of peasants and of the petty toiling population of the towns." (*Ibid.*)

From this Comrade Stalin draws the conclusion that it is necessary "to achieve a combination of the 'proletarian revolution' not only with a 'peasant war' but also with a 'national war.'" (*Ibid.*)

The fourth new factor which the Bolsheviks introduced into the national question is the element:

"... of real (and not merely juridical) equalization of nations (helping and encouraging the backward nations to raise themselves to the cultural and economic level of the more advanced nations)." (*Ibid.*, p. 115.)

This constitutes one of the prerequisites for the fraternal cooperation of the toiling masses of various nations. This differs essentially from the declamations of the Second International on "national equalization," for equalization remains a mere phrase if the possibility of its complete realization is not created.

However, the Second International not only rejected the struggle for the liberation of the oppressed peoples and colonies but it also invented "theories" to justify national oppression. It tried to prove that the struggle of the oppressed colonial peoples conflicted with the interests of the European proletariat. Their "theories" on decolonization, the "progressive role of imperialism in the colonies," on the "evolutionary development of the colonies," on the "unpreparedness of the colonial peoples for a conscious struggle," supplied imperialism with the ideological weapons against the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and colonies.

Comrade Stalin delivered the first annihilating blow at the leaders of the Second International in his pamphlet *Marxism and the National*

Question about which Lenin wrote to Gorky:

"With regard to nationalism I fully share your opinion that we must pay serious attention to it. We have a splendid Georgian here who is writing a lengthy article for the *Prosveshcheniye* in which he has assembled all the Austrian and other material." (Lenin, *Letters to Gorky*, 1908-13, p. 75.)

This book is Stalin's first fundamental work on the national question but it is theoretically such a thoroughly conceived Marxist program on the national question that to this day it constitutes one of the most important Marxist textbooks on the national question. Comrade Stalin wrote the book even before the outbreak of the first imperialist war, at the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1913. It was a time when national hatreds were being incited, when nationalism and chauvinism were serving imperialism. It was the time when the West European parties of the Second International had already begun to degenerate into parties of "social reforms"; since, for them, the struggle for the overthrow of imperialism had become pointless, they could not display any interest on the question of allies in this struggle. On the national question, they supplanted socialism by nationalism. All the parties of the Second International were dominated by Renner's and Bauer's "Austrian school" of "national cultural autonomy." In Russia, it was the time of the final break with the Mensheviks by the Bolsheviks and the creation of an independent Bolshevik Party,

a party of a new type, free from opportunist elements, a party capable of leading the proletariat in the struggle for power.

For a short time during this period, which for Comrade Stalin was an interval between prison and exile, he was able to go to Vienna, where he met Lenin and where he participated in the February Conference of the Bolsheviks as a member of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Here, in the home of "Austro-Marxism," Comrade Stalin wrote his work *Marxism and the Colonial Question*.

* * *

What is a nation? What is the essence of the national movements? Why is the national-cultural autonomy of Renner and Bauer, why is the position of the Bundists, the Trotskyites and the Mensheviks, the purest bourgeois nationalism? What is a really Marxist position on the national question? What tasks follow from this for the working class and its leading Party? These are the questions which Comrade Stalin not only posed in their full scope but also solved twenty-six years ago.

In order to solve the national question correctly and to give a theoretical foundation to the basic slogan of the Bolsheviks on the national question: *the right of self-determination of all nations up to political secession*, and at the same time to smash the Austro-Marxist slogan of "national-cultural autonomy," Comrade Stalin first examined the fundamental question:

What is a nation? It is not, as Springer (Renner) asserted, "a union or similarly thinking and similarly speaking persons." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 9.) It is not a cultural community, a community of character, a community of fate, as Bauer alleged. It is not the creation of the "national spirit" nor any other mystical "popular soul." Nor is it a community of race or tribe.

For the first time, an exhaustive Marxist definition of a nation is given us by Comrade Stalin:

"A nation is an historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." (*Ibid.*, p. 8.) A nation is thus an historical category. But it is not merely an historical category. It is an historical category of a definite epoch, namely, of rising capitalism which liquidates disunity.

A nation is a community to be sure. But it is not a community of fate. Within every nation, the struggle of the classes of capitalist society proceeds and intensifies. Lenin coined the phrase: "Within every modern nation, there are two nations."

That is why the proletariat must follow its own course, the course of the class struggle, in the national question. The proletariat must wage an energetic struggle against every form of national oppression; it must advocate the unrestricted right of every nation to self-determination up to the point of political secession. But this struggle must be

adapted to the concrete historical circumstances in every given situation. In 1926, in the Yugoslav Commission of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Comrade Stalin emphasized once more that "the right to secession must not be understood as an obligation, as a duty to secede." (*Ibid.*, p. 205.)

"The right of self-determination means that only the nation itself has the right to determine its destiny, that no one has the right forcibly to interfere in the life of the nation, to destroy its schools and other institutions, to violate its habits and customs, to repress its language, or curtail its rights. . . .

"A nation can arrange its life according to its own will. It has the right to arrange its life on the basis of autonomy. It has the right to enter into federal relations with other nations. It has the right to complete secession. Nations are sovereign and all nations are equal.

"This, of course, does not mean that Social-Democrats will support every demand of a nation." (*Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.)

"On the contrary, it is the duty of Social-Democrats to conduct such agitation and to endeavor to influence the will of nations so that the nations may arrange their affairs in the way that will best suit the interests of the proletariat." (*Ibid.*, p. 53.)

In his report to the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), Comrade Stalin considered it indispensable to point out also that under certain circumstances, the right to self-determination may even come into

conflict with the class interests of the proletariat.

"In such cases—this must be said bluntly—the right to self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the exercise by the working class of its right to dictatorship. The former must give way to the latter." (*Ibid.*, p. 168.)

Lenin and Stalin teach us that every question—and that is particularly true with regard to the national question—can be solved correctly only by *taking into account the given concrete historical conditions*. The very same question must be posed differently as soon as the concrete conditions of the life and activity of a nation have changed. About the middle of the nineteenth century, Marx supported the secession of Poland from Russia. But at the end of the nineteenth century, the Polish Marxists were opposed to secession by Poland, and they were right:

"... for during the fifty years that had elapsed, profound changes had taken place, bringing Russia and Poland closer economically and culturally." (*Ibid.*, p. 21.)

For that reason, Comrade Stalin never tires of repeating:

"Once again, the concrete historical conditions as the starting point, the dialectical presentation of the problem as the only correct way of presenting it—such is the key to the national problem." (*Ibid.*, p. 26.)

Approaching the question in this way, Comrade Stalin discloses the whole *reactionary content of the so-called "national cultural auton-*

omy." He proves that it contradicts the entire course of the development of nations. During the first stages of capitalism, nations became unified but in the later stages of capitalism, a process set in in which not all the persons belonging to a nation live in a continuous stretch of territory, where diverse groups secede from the nations and settle in other areas and adopt new customs and new manners and perhaps even a new language. Whoever thinks of embracing these groups in a uniform national union believes in miracles and wants to turn back the wheels of history.

National autonomy also contradicts the entire course of the class struggle. The "Austrian school" wants to weld the bourgeoisie and the proletariat according to national characteristics into a "community of culture," a "community of fate." That is, it wants to exclude the class struggle. It is no accident that this "theory" led to the reactionary racist theory, to the theories of the "community of the people," of the denial of the class struggle, of the subordination of class interests to national demands, of class collaboration and class peace. All this, however, contradicts historical development since the development of large-scale industry and the intensification of the class struggle prevents the formation of a "national community." "What 'common fate' can there be when the bourgeoisie thirsts for war, and the proletariat declares 'war on war'?" (*Ibid.*, p. 32.)

In place of the reactionary theories of the Second International,

Comrade Stalin presented a Bolshevik program which, together with Lenin's works, constituted the foundation for the national policy of the Bolsheviks.

"... Complete democracy in the country is the basis and condition for the solution of the national problem." (*Ibid.*, p. 56.)

"... *The right of self-determination is an essential element in the solution of the national problem.*" (*Ibid.*)

"... *Regional autonomy [in contrast to national cultural autonomy!—G. O.] is an essential element in the solution of the national problem.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 58.)

"... *National equality in all forms (language, schools, etc.) is an essential element in the solution of the national problem.*" (*Ibid.*)

"... *The principle of international solidarity of the workers is an essential element in the solution of the national problem.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 61.)

Here was a revolutionary program which could be realized only by the overthrow of tsarism. The fundamental feature of the Bolshevik treatment of the national question consisted from the very start in the fact that the Bolsheviks always regarded the national question in inseparable connection with the revolutionary perspective. The Bolsheviks have never separated the national question from the general question of the revolution, either before October or after October.

* * *

At the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin developed fundamentally new view-

points on the national and colonial question.

The difference between those countries that oppress other peoples and the oppressed peoples, between the colonies and the home countries; the establishment of the fact that with the general crisis of capitalism, a new stage in the movement of the toiling masses of the colonies begins in which these masses become an active factor in world politics and in the struggle against imperialism, hence reserves of the world revolution and allies of the Soviet Union; the presence of two tendencies within the national revolutions of the colonies, one that wants to come to terms with imperialism and the other that struggles, under the leadership of the proletariat, against imperialism—these are the basic ideas of Lenin's strategic plan which Comrade Stalin developed further.

In his speech before the session of the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Bolshevik Party on August 1, 1927, Comrade Stalin said: the starting point in the treatment of questions of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and the dependent countries:

"... is a strict *differentiation* between revolution in imperialist countries, countries that oppress other peoples, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, countries that suffer from the imperialist oppression of other states. Revolution in imperialist countries is one thing: in those countries the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other peoples; it is counter-revolu-

tionary in all stages of the revolution; the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is absent in these countries. Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing: in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states is one of the factors of revolution; this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie, at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor." (*Ibid.*, pp. 232-33.)

In this decisively important question which Lenin described as "the most important and fundamental idea" of the theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International on the national and colonial question, the bitterest struggle had to be waged against Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev and their gang. These enemies of the revolution wanted to prevent the support of the bourgeois liberation movements in the colonies under all circumstances.

As early as 1927, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "only people who are forsaking Leninism and joining the followers of the Second International can talk like this," (*Ibid.*, p. 234) and that *temporary agreements with the bourgeoisie in the colonial countries are not only permissible at a certain stage of the colonial revolution but are actually necessary.*

True to the Leninist position that every question must be studied concretely and historically, Com-

rade Stalin also emphasized the necessity of taking into account *the peculiarities and the differences in each colony.* In this question, also, he did not tolerate any schematic formula. He established first of all that there is no longer a homogeneous and all-embracing colonial East. (Speech before the students of the Eastern University on May 18, 1925, in *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, pp. 206-220.) There are at least three categories of colonial and dependent countries:

"Firstly, there are countries like Morocco, which have no proletariat or almost no proletariat, and which industrially are completely undeveloped. Secondly, there are countries like China and Egypt, which are industrially little developed, and which have a comparatively small proletariat. Thirdly, there are countries like India, which are capitalistically more or less developed, and which possess a more or less numerous national proletariat." (*Ibid.*, p. 216.)

From this Comrade Stalin deduces the special tasks which flow from the differences in the colonies and the dependent countries.

* * *

The correct national policy of the Bolsheviks has contributed substantially to the victory of the great socialist October Revolution. Already at the April Conference in 1917, when Comrade Stalin once more dealt with the question of the right of the oppressed peoples to secession, he predicted the following for the peoples of Russia:

"But now that tsarism no longer exists, its policy of oppression no longer exists, this mistrust is bound to diminish and the attraction towards Russia increase. I believe that now, after the overthrow of tsarism, nine-tenths of the peoples will not desire secession." (*Ibid.*, p. 65.)

This prediction by Comrade Stalin has also been confirmed. In his article "The October Revolution and the National Policy of the Russian Communists" of November, 1921, Comrade Stalin states:

"Peace, the agrarian revolution and freedom for the nationalities—these were the three principal factors which served to rally the peasants of more than twenty nationalities in the vast expanse of Russia around the red flag of the Russian proletariat." (*Ibid.*, p. 117.)

This article states further:

"This confidence alone could form the basis for that indestructible union of the peoples of the R.S.F.S.R. against which all 'diplomatic' machinations and carefully executed 'blockades' have proved impotent.

"More, the Russian workers could not have defeated Kolchak, Denikin and Wrangel had they not enjoyed the sympathy and confidence of the oppressed masses of the border regions of former Russia. It must not be forgotten that the field of action of these mutinous generals was confined to the area of the border regions inhabited mainly by non-Russian nationalities, and the latter could not but hate Kolchak, Denikin and Wrangel for their imperialist policy and policy of Russification. The Entente, intervening and supporting these generals, could rely

only on the elements in the border regions which were the vehicles of Russification. And thereby it only inflamed the hatred of the population of the border regions for the mutinous generals and increased the sympathy of this population for the Soviet Government.

"This circumstance accounted for the intrinsic weakness of the Kolchak, Denikin and Wrangel rear, and, therefore, for the weakness of their fronts, that is, in the long run, for their defeat." (*Ibid.*, pp. 118-19.)

In his report to the April Conference, Comrade Stalin dealt among other things, with the question—which plays no slight role even today—*why the ruling class in its national and colonial oppression is able to find support also among several other sections of the population*. It is supported by those sections of the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and the upper layers of the working class which derive one or another advantage from the plunder of the oppressed nations.

"There is thus a whole choir of social forces which support national oppression, headed by the landed and financial aristocracy. In order to create a real democratic system, it is first necessary to clear the soil and remove this choir from the political stage." (*Ibid.*, p. 63.)

At the time of the April Conference, the Finnish question was also of the utmost importance. Comrade Stalin dealt with it in this report in connection with the question of *what national movements should be supported by the international proletariat*. "We must support every

movement directed against imperialism," Comrade Stalin said. (*Ibid.*, p. 67.) The Provisional Government refused to recognize the independence of the Finnish people; it even refused to grant Finland extended autonomy. It simply continued the imperialist policy of tsarism. The Trotskyites and Bukharinites were likewise opposed to the right of Finland to self-determination up to the point of secession. True to the Bolshevik principles, the Bolsheviks alone, Lenin and Stalin, demanded the right of Finland to complete self-determination up to the point of political secession. Together with the Finnish people, they waged the struggle for the independence of Finland. This struggle against the Trotskyites and Bukharinites was continued after the victory of the October Revolution. The position of Lenin and Stalin was finally victorious. Finland received its independence from the Bolsheviks, at the hands of Lenin and Stalin.

The Finnish bourgeoisie, however, soon surrendered the independence which it had received from the Bolsheviks, it called foreign imperialists into the country and later became a vassal of the Entente powers. In 1919-20, it even participated in the intervention of the Entente against Soviet Russia. In his article "The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia" Comrade Stalin pointed out that Poland and Finland:

"... have retained only the semblance of independence, while in reality they have been converted

into unconditional vassals of the Entente." (*Ibid.*, p. 79.)

There are only two alternatives for such countries, Comrade Stalin wrote in 1920:

"Either they join forces with Russia, and then the toiling masses of the border regions will be emancipated from imperialist oppression; "Or they join forces with the Entente, and then the yoke of imperialism is inevitable.

"There is no third solution. So-called independence of . . . so-called independent [countries] . . . is only an illusion, and conceals the utter dependence of these apologies for states on one group of imperialists or another." (*Ibid.*)

The reports and theses by Comrade Stalin at the April Conference, the Tenth, Twelfth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.), and his writings in this world historic period of the consolidation of Soviet power and the construction of socialism constitute further documents of fundamental importance for the national question. The very first constitutional document of the Soviet Government, the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia," which was published on November 15, 1917, was written by Comrade Stalin while People's Commissar for Nationalities. Among other things, it discloses the following basic principles:

"1. Equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia.

"2. The right of the peoples of Russia to voluntary self-determination up to the point of secession and the establishment of independent states.

"3. Abolition of all and sundry national and national-religious privileges and restrictions.

"4. Free development of the national minorities and the ethnological groups inhabiting the territory of Russia." (*Decrees of the October Revolution*, p. 30, Russian ed.)

In Comrade Stalin's report to the Tenth Party Congress on March 10, 1921, the tasks of the Party on the national question are further developed:

"The crux of the national problem in the R.S.F.S.R.," Comrade Stalin said, "lies in the obligation to put an end to that backwardness (economic, political and cultural) of the nationalities which we have inherited from the past and to afford the backward peoples the opportunity of catching up with Central Russia politically, culturally and economically." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 103.)

That is how the victorious proletariat poses the national question. In this spirit, the Resolution of the Party Congress decided on the following tasks:

"... to help the toiling masses of the non-Great-Russian peoples to catch up with Central Russia, which is ahead of them, and to help them (a) to develop and consolidate their own Soviet state system in forms consistent with the national character of these peoples; (b) to organize their own courts, administrative bodies, economic organs and government organs functioning in the native language and recruited from among local people acquainted with the customs and psychology of the local population, and (c) to develop

a press, schools, theaters, clubs and cultural and educational institutions generally, functioning in the native language." (*Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.)

That is the road of the equality of nations in the spirit of Lenin and Stalin.

The decisions of the Tenth Party Congress could be transformed into deeds only by a bitter struggle on two fronts. The introduction of the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) led to a certain strengthening of the Great-Power chauvinism as well as of local nationalism which even penetrated the Party ranks. The bearers of this degeneration concealed themselves behind the mask of internationalism. Trotsky, Pyatakov, Bukharin, and Radek opposed the basic demands of the Party. The Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc tried in every way to prevent aid to the formerly oppressed nations. It tried in every way to thwart the industrialization of the national regions. It raised the colonization demand of "industrialization of the processing of agricultural raw materials." All of them fought against the accelerated tempo of doing away with the inequality among the nations and thereby supplied the cue to all the counter-revolutionary groupings. All kinds of reactionary theories were hauled out, among others, Kautsky's theory of the disappearance of national differences within the framework of a state in which the backward peoples are assimilated with the "civilized" peoples.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Trotskyites and their asso-

ciates did everything to remove, from the important office of People's Commissar for Nationalities, Comrade Stalin, who was putting the Bolshevik national policy into practice. It was Lenin who gave them a rebuff:

"We are solving it [the national question] and we need a person to whom any representative of a nation can come and talk freely about the problem. Where are we to find him?" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 263-64, Russian ed.)

Lenin considered one candidate possible—Comrade Stalin. Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the enemies of the Party and the Soviet Government were exposed and destroyed. Comrade Stalin not only exposed the counter-revolutionary contents of the arguments of the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites and national chauvinists of all shades; he also taught the working class how to defeat successfully the enemies of the people by a *correct approach to the national minorities*. The advice which he gave to the Communists at that time is invaluable for us today in the struggle against imperialism, for winning the peoples of the dependent countries and colonies. Comrade Stalin reproached several Communists of the former dominant Russian nation in their work among the formerly oppressed nations, for not sufficiently taking into account the peculiarities of the class stratification, the culture, the daily life, the historical past of the given people. He pointed out that this led to a *deviation from Communism in the direction of Great-*

Power tendencies, to a colonization policy, to Great-Russian chauvinism. On the other hand, the Communists of the formerly oppressed nations often exaggerated the national peculiarities and did not pay sufficient attention to the class interests of the toilers, or confused the interests of the toilers of the given nation with the "general national" interests. Such a position led to a *deviation in the direction of local nationalism*. The Party Congress decisively condemned both deviations and indicated ways and means of combating them.

At the Twelfth Party Congress, Comrade Stalin deepened the question of the correct relation to the oppressed nations. He demanded that the needs and requirements of the nations be given a sensitive ear. He emphasized the international significance of the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union for the peoples oppressed by imperialism who constitute "the heavy reserves" of the revolution. "By the will of historical destiny," Comrade Stalin said, we "now represent the vanguard of the world revolution." (*Ibid.*, p. 147.) The oppressed peoples turn their eyes to the Soviet land which solves the national question.

"Do not forget such reserves as those constituted by the oppressed peoples, who remain silent, but whose very silence exerts pressure and decides much. This is often not felt, but these peoples live, they exist, and they must not be forgotten. Yes, comrades, it is dangerous to forget them." (*Ibid.*, pp. 154-55.)

Simultaneously with his exposure of the essence of the deviations on the national question, Comrade Stalin solved a series of the most difficult theoretical problems. Thus, for example, following Lenin, he showed that national differences and languages will continue to exist even long after the victory of the proletariat throughout the world. He showed that the slogan of national culture is bourgeois and reactionary only under the domination of capital. Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the slogan of a culture, socialist in content and national in form, is indispensable. That is why, in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Bolsheviks are for the highest possible development of such a culture, national in form and socialist in content. Only on such a foundation can all these national cultures be fused into one common culture and a common language be achieved in the distant future.

* * *

At the Eighth Special All-Union Congress of Soviets in 1936, Comrade Stalin summarized the results of the national policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.) and the Soviet Government since 1917. Up to the great socialist October Revolution and in the capitalist world to this day, history has known only unsuccessful attempts at embracing many nationalities in a single state, for example, the unsuccessful attempt of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The first as well as the second imperialist World War reveal the profound

national contradictions and the inherent untenability of the multinational imperialist states. Multinational imperialist Poland collapsed like a house of cards in eight to ten days. Only the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government have succeeded unqualifiedly in building up a state of many nationalities. The Stalinist Constitution adopted by the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of the Soviets of the U.S.S.R. is the *crowning victory of the Lenin-Stalin national policy*. In his report to this Congress, Comrade Stalin said:

"How is this victory to be explained?

"The very absence of the exploiting classes which are the principal organizers of strife among the nationalities, the absence of exploitation, breeding mutual distrust and fanning nationalist passions, the fact that the power is held by the working class which is the enemy of all enslavement and the faithful bearer of ideas of internationalism, the materialization in reality of mutual aid of the peoples in all fields of economic and social life, and finally the high development of the national culture of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., culture that is national in form and socialist in content—as a result of all these and similar factors, the peoples of the U.S.S.R., have radically changed their characteristics. Their feeling of mutual distrust has disappeared. The feeling of mutual friendship has developed, and thus fraternal cooperation of the peoples has been established in the system of a single union state.

"As a result, we now have a fully formed multi-national socialist

state, which has passed all tests and which has a stability which any national state in any part of the world may well envy." (J. V. Stalin, *On the New Soviet Constitution*, pp. 10-11, International Publishers, New York, 1936.)

Article 123 of the Stalinist Constitution reads:

"The equality of the rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law." (*Constitution of the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 42-43, International Publishers, New York.)

Thus the Stalinist Constitution created a prototype for the establishment of lasting peace and fraternal friendship among the peoples.

* * *

The latest stage of the irresistibly victorious advance of the Lenin-Stalin national policy is the liberation of the West Ukrainians and West Byelo-Russians from the yoke of Polish imperialism. Regarding this, Comrade Molotov was able to say the following in his report to the Fifth Extraordinary Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on October 31, 1939:

"The recent elections to the National Assemblies of the Western

Ukraine and Western Byelo-Russia, conducted for the first time in the history of those territories on the basis of universal, direct and equal suffrage and a secret ballot, have shown that at least nine-tenths of the population of these regions have long been ready to rejoin the Soviet Union." (Molotov's *Report to the Supreme Soviet*, p. 11. Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

The pacts with the Baltic states likewise show the growing confidence of the small nations in the Soviet Union, as the sole power on which the small nations can rely.

At the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.) sixteen years ago, Comrade Stalin posed the question of destiny:

"Either we shall, within the Union, find a correct solution for the national problem in practical application and establish truly fraternal relations and true collaboration between the peoples—in which case the entire East will see that our federation is the banner of its liberation, an advance guard, in whose footsteps it must follow—and that will be the beginning of the collapse of world imperialism; or we, the federation as a whole, commit an error, undermine the confidence of the formerly oppressed peoples in the proletariat of Russia, and deprive the Union of Republics of that power of attraction which it possesses in the eyes of the East—in which case imperialism will win and we shall lose." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 148.)

Only sixteen years have elapsed

since that time. And today, we can already state: the question posed by Comrade Stalin has already been decided in favor of socialism.

* * *

With the Bolshevik teachings on the national and colonial question, Lenin and Stalin forged one of the most effective weapons of the international proletariat in its struggle against the imperialist yoke. Lenin's and Stalin's teachings on the national and colonial question help the international working class to transform one of the most important pillars of the capitalist world system, one of the sources of the artificial delay of the overthrow of capitalism, the national oppression of the colonies and the dependent countries, into one of the most important factors in the struggle against capitalism.

In face of the imperialist war which is being waged for the re-division of markets, sources of raw material, highways of commerce, the spheres of capital investment, in a word, for colonies and dependent countries, but which also intensifies the crisis of capitalism, of the dominant social system, the national and colonial question acquires even greater importance.

Imperialism endeavors to utilize the national question for its own interest. The imperialists' war aims are cloaked in phrases about the "national tasks," "national interests," the "protection of small nations," and so forth. That's the way it was in the first imperialist World War and that's the way it is today.

Lenin pointed out how carefully

the general staffs tried to utilize the national and revolutionary movements in the enemy's camp during the course of the war. He stated:

"We would be very poor revolutionists if, in the great liberation struggle of the proletariat for socialism, we did not know how to take advantage of *every* popular movement against each *individual* case of oppression by imperialism in order to intensify and extend the crisis." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 337-38.)

In the present imperialist war, under the new conditions, the national and colonial question plays an even greater role. This time, also, the imperialists are attempting to utilize it in the interest of strengthening their own front and disrupting the front and the rear of the enemy. But the situation is different from what it was during the first imperialist World War. Today, there is the great state of the victorious toilers, the socialist Soviet Union. Today, the oppressed nations have the experiences of the first imperialist world war and the period between the first and second imperialist wars behind them. They have experienced in their own persons that the promises which the imperialists make during the war vanish with the wind after the war. They are convinced by the living example of the friendship of the peoples in the Soviet Union that it is possible finally to solve the national and colonial question; they have also come to know the road that leads to this solution. They have drawn important lessons from the national

liberation struggles of the Chinese people and the Spanish Republicans. And, finally, there are Communist Parties in all countries today which follow the great example of the Bolsheviks.

In the first imperialist war, the international working class, because of the weakness of the revolutionary proletarian movement, was not yet able to become the leader of the national and colonial liberation movements. That is why the imperialists were able to utilize such movements during the war as well as in the conclusion of the peace treaties for *their* interests. In the present war—based on the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, on the example of the fraternal union of the most diverse peoples in the land of victorious socialism—the international proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Parties, is in a position to transform the

“heavy reserves” of imperialism into reserves of the international proletarian revolution and to lead them in the storming of the capitalist system.

The Communists and the entire working class in the capitalist countries have a valuable weapon for this struggle. Appearing in various languages of the world under the title of “Marxism and the National and Colonial Question” is a collection of the most important articles and speeches by Comrade Stalin from 1912 to 1936. A treasury of Marxism-Leninism has been opened up to the toilers in the capitalist countries, especially at this time when the new imperialist war brings the national and colonial question directly to the fore and imposes the task upon the international working class of solving this question in the struggle against imperialism.

Observations on an Issue of "Neuer Vorwaerts"

BY K. FUNK

AMONG the "conclusive arguments" advanced by the writers of the Second International to prove that this is no imperialist war and that the bourgeoisie of England and France are not fighting for their own imperialist world domination but are waging war against "Hitlerism," in the "common interest," also in the interest of the German people, is the allusion to the position adopted by the leaders of former German Social-Democracy in this war. "Look at the leaders of German Social-Democracy," so the "argument" runs, "unlike 1914-18, they have not granted war credits to the German bourgeoisie in this war; on the contrary, they have the same goal as the Social-Democratic leaders of England and France, to help the allied Western Powers defeat Germany."

From this position of the Hilferdings, Stampfers, Geyers and Company, the war propagandists in the camp of the Second International draw a conclusion which is intended to disguise the imperialist war aims and to use the workers of England and France in the service of Anglo-French imperialism: the leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties of England, France and Germany are

unanimously on the side of the allied Western Powers in this war—thus the war which England and France are waging against Germany is a war which the workers of all three countries must support since, in the last analysis, it will lead to the "liberation" of Germany.

Stampfer, the old whip behind the policy of "carrying on to the end" under Wilhelm II, says piously: "There are no credit granters and no credit refusers in German Social-Democracy. . . ." The old hag is trying to say here: "If we who are known to have formerly laid the required war credits unhesitatingly at the feet of our own bourgeoisie and to have aided the police in their struggle against Liebknecht, if we therefore do not do the same today as we did then, then this war must have an entirely different character from the one in 1914, then we must support it on the side of England and France."

These former Social-Democratic leaders to whom fell the task of campaigning as living examples of the "ideological," the "crusade," character of this imperialist war shamelessly invoke the very thing which has made them particularly

hated by the international working class: their slavish association with their own bourgeoisie. They invoke this in order then "to argue": "If this time, even *we* do not side with our bourgeoisie in the war, then it is really a war which everyone must support.'

We pick up any issue of the *Neuer Vorwaerts* and find the whole shame of this so-called "party leadership" of the Socialist Party of Germany reflected in it. Hilferding, who a long time ago was concerned theoretically with finance capital only to sink later to the position of financial minister of German finance capital, gives us a lecture in this issue of the *Neuer Vorwaerts* to the effect that the policy of England and France generally could not be imperialist because "non-aggressive imperialism" is a "contradiction in itself." France and England would have made "constant concessions" to Germany, would have "sacrificed important positions of power" in order to preserve peace—even "at the price of a real diminution of power." It is a notorious sleight-of-hand trick to describe only those states as imperialist which are aggressors at the given moment. According to this definition, imperialism would be like an acute sickness of scarlet fever and grippe which suddenly breaks out and just as suddenly disappears. According to this definition, England was imperialist when it attacked the Boers, the Indians, the Chinese, the Egyptians, etc., but later, after Hilferding's medical care, it shook off this illness and today English imperialism is pure.

And what about the first imperialist war, Mr. Hilferding, when the leaders of German Social-Democracy were blustering against English imperialism? And what about Versailles when England and France took possession of the former German colonies and the former Turkish provinces? And what about the time when England and France sent their troops against the young Soviet state? And what about today when England and France not only resort to military aggression but are also trying with all their might to drag all the peoples into the war? But entirely aside from the fact that England and France are aggressors today, it is of course not a passing illness which strikes now one and now another state. Imperialism is the world system of the capitalist monopolies, of colonial oppression and pillage. And in this world system, the Hilferdings and Co. have assumed the task of diverting the workers from the struggle against imperialism and of supplying them as cannon fodder to the imperialist masters.

The tendentious untruthfulness of Hilferding's "argumentation," however, must be illuminated from still another angle. The "price of a real diminution of power" which the imperialists of England and France temporarily paid their German competitors was not taken out of their own pockets. At Munich, for example, the Anglo-French imperialists did not pay with their own territory; in Munich, in Spain, in China, etc., they paid with the land and blood of other peoples just as they now attempt to let other peo-

ple wage the war which they have begun in defense of their own imperialist supremacy and their gigantic colonial empires. The alleged "non-aggressive" imperialists of England and France are the real aggressors at present, although so far they have not dared to attack on the West Front; they are still aggressors because they are instigating and inciting war in the north and southeast of Europe, in the small neutral states of Western Europe and in the countries of the Near East. They want to widen the fronts and extend the theater of war at all costs. They are everywhere creating new points of explosion.

Hilferding knows this very well and he and his political friends know the role assigned to them in this criminal game. This role consists in bliterating and denying the imperialist character of the war in order to confuse the working class and render it impotent. This role further consists in contributing to the assembling and organizing of those forces in Germany itself which are ready to subordinate themselves and become a part of the English plans. If the first part of the task assumed by the former leaders of German Social-Democracy in the pay of English imperialism merits attention, the second part merits it no less, particularly since it is especially helpful in exposing the whole game.

Hilferding is a man whose white-hot hostility towards the land which has realized socialism is notorious. At the time when the governments of England and France, in face of the pressure of the broad masses in

their countries for a strong peace front, gave the appearance of being willing to contribute to the saving of peace by a pact with the U.S.S.R., Hilferding and his friends considered it necessary to demonstrate their undiminished hostility to the U.S.S.R. They even announced the intensification of their anti-Soviet incitement in case a pact should be concluded between the Anglo-French governments and the U.S.S.R.

It was only to be expected that, once the war was prevented between the two greatest countries of Europe—as a result of the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union—Hilferding and Co. should then go in search of elements to rally in Germany which are dissatisfied with the German-Soviet friendship. On whom does Hilferding orientate himself in this search? First of all, on *capitalist elements*! Hilferding asserts that the war between England, France and Germany did not arise out of a conflict of capitalist interests and that not only are the English and French capitalists not responsible for the war but "the German capitalist class did not want it either!" He needs this falsification, which slaps historical truth in the face, for the infamous purpose of constructing a community of interests among the capitalists of England, France and Germany, which the workers should join, that is, to which they should subordinate themselves.

"There is no class struggle," Hilferding commands in his old police manner. And for that reason, there should be a "community of inter-

ests" of the West, based on civil peace, which is to be aimed against the East. Hilferding, in the pay of Anglo-French imperialism—who not long ago desperately asked whether there was not some way of bringing pressure on the present German regime to force it into a military conflict with the U.S.S.R.—is now seeking, as an agent betraying his people and his country, for capitalists in Germany who will allow themselves to be convinced of the advantages offered by a vassal existence in the shadow of England.

Thereby, under the new conditions of the war and at the direct behest of English imperialism, Hilferding and his political friends are continuing the struggle which they have been waging for years. For their whole "struggle against Hitlerism" consisted of maintaining connections with certain capitalist groups, with clerical reactionaries and reactionary members of the bureaucracy and the officers corps, so that after the expected resurrection, they can be installed as coalition-experienced experts in the suppression of the working class.

Hilferding's, Stampfer's and Geyer's "struggle against Hitlerism" was a struggle in defense of the privileges of the capitalists and not a struggle for the interests of the toilers. Stampfer coined the phrase about the "proud Rhenish industrialists" by which is meant those employer circles that might some day decide on a change of regime in Germany. And Stampfer and Hilferding championed these "proud Rhenish industrialists" against the plebeian supporters of National-

Socialism and against whose increasingly insistent anti-capitalist demands, they believed it necessary to warn the capitalists. Now Hilferding and Co. are staking on the anti-Soviet card.

English imperialism therefore grabs them up and uses them—regardless of the fact that they are discredited in Germany—as disruptive factors, for the Anglo-French imperialist plans for supremacy in Europe have little prospect of realization if they do not succeed in destroying Soviet-German friendship.

Hilferding and Company are instruments to confuse the ranks of the toilers for the reactionary capitalist circles in Germany who are ready to betray their own country to English imperialism in order to save their privileges and profits. For this purpose they unscrupulously risk the blood of their own people in the service of the imperialist plans for intervention against the Land of Socialism.

If, therefore, the former leaders of German Social-Democracy, who are warmongers in the pay of English imperialism, want to appeal to the workers of other countries now on the ground that this time, unlike 1914, they have not granted war credits to their own bourgeoisie and therefore merit their confidence, then it is apparent from reading even a single issue of the *Neuer Vorwaerts* that the Social-Democratic paid scribes of English imperialism are being directly sustained by English funds this time. They are receiving these payments, charged to the account of those reactionary

capitalist circles whom Stampfer described as the "proud Rhenish industrialists," and on whose direct action within Germany, English imperialism is speculating.

In the same issue of *Neuer Vorwaerts*, Stampfer hails the alleged advantages of capitalism over socialism, and the Social-Democratic editor, Robert Groetzsch, former well-known sentimental bedroom story writer, publishes a little story on the "starving millionaire," referring to Thyssen, asking for sympathy for a millionaire in Germany who is allegedly prevented from eating more butter than is allotted to him because of the food rationing and the spying of his servants. Stampfer praises the "good old time" of liberal capitalism when even a disciplined worker was able to exist by "opening a store." All this is supposed to prove that, as Hilferding already wrote, "there is no class struggle"—namely in the imagination and in the wishes of these Social-Democratic war propagandists.

Hilferding and Stampfer are exerting a great deal of effort to turn the workers away from Marxism in order to persuade them to collaborate harmoniously with the capitalists, and to slander socialism which has been realized in the U.S.-S.R. Thereby, the plan which they are trying to realize at the behest of English imperialism becomes even more obvious. In connection with

the war which England and France are waging against Germany, they want to prevent the destruction of any capitalist positions so that, on the contrary, by means of lying "anti-Hitler" demagoguery, new reactionary capitalist influences over the toilers of Germany may take effect so that Germany, under the protectorate of English imperialism, may become a fortress and deploying ground against the U.S.S.R. While the German toilers see in German-Soviet friendship the basis for a real peace and place all their hopes in deepening this friendship, the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders seek to undermine and destroy this friendship. They believe they can win the favor and support of reactionary capitalist elements by showing that they are consistent enemies of the country that has realized socialism and by championing the sanctity of capitalist privileges.

Thus the perusal of one issue of *Neuer Vorwaerts* shows that the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders who come forward in the armed hosts of English imperialism as examples and preachers of the "crusade against Hitlerism," do this precisely in the interest and in the pay of such reactionary circles of the German bourgeoisie as those who are connected with English imperialism and who want to prevent the German toiling people from finally securing a real peace by friendship with the U.S.S.R.

A DISTINGUISHED SPRING LIST

FORTHCOMING BOOKS—

War and Revolution, by V. I. Lenin, Vol. XIX, Lenin's Collected Works

Why Farmers Are Poor: The Agricultural Crisis in America, by Anna Rochester

The South in Progress, by Katherine Lumpkin

Dialectics of Nature, by Frederick Engels

Salute to Spring, by Meridel Le Seuer

Shoes: The Industry and the Workers, by Horace Davis



FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS—

The War and the Workers, by V. I. Lenin

Historical Materialism, by Frederick Engels

Dialectical and Historical Materialism, by Joseph Stalin

Lenin on Youth

Stalin on Youth

The Negro in the American Revolution, by Herbert Aptheker

The Role of the Individual in History, by George Plekhanov



Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH SELECTION FOR APRIL

STALIN

Many of the outstanding leaders of the Soviet Union have contributed to make this book a comprehensive evaluation of Stalin's contributions and his historic role in establishing socialism on one-sixth of the earth.

Stalin's work in many spheres, as a military leader and strategist during the intervention and in building the Red Army and Navy; in developing socialist industry and collectivizing agriculture; in successfully launching and fulfilling the Five-Year Plans of socialist construction; in the solution of the national question of the U.S.S.R.; in charting the course of socialist democracy as embodied in the Stalinist Constitution of the U.S.S.R.; in shaping and guiding the peace policy of the Soviet Union; and, above all, his magnificent contributions to Marxist-Leninist theory, are dealt with in this book by his closest co-workers.

Among the contributors are V. M. Molotov, Klementi Voroshilov, L. M. Kaganovich, Georgi Dimitroff, M. M. Kalinin, A. Andreyev, L. Beria, and others.

192 pages. Clothbound

Price 75 cents

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.